United Nations S/PV.3691

Security Council

Fifty-first Year

Provisional

3691st Meeting

Friday, 23 August 1996, 10.30 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Eitel	(Germany)
Members:	Botswana	Mr. Nkgowe
	Chile	Mr. Somavía
	China	Mr. HE Yafei
	Egypt	Mr. Abdel Aziz
	France	Mr. Ladsous
	Guinea-Bissau	Mr. Lopes Cabral
	Honduras	Mr. Martínez Blanco
	Indonesia	Mr. Wibisono
	Italy	Mr. Fulci
	Poland	Mr. Wrobel
	Republic of Korea	Mr. Park
	Russian Federation	Mr. Lavrov
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Gomersall
	United States of America	Mr. Gnehm

Agenda

The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

96-86116 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation between Iraq and Kuwait

The President: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Following consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council, on the eve of the planned visit to Baghdad by the Executive Chairman of the Special Commission, strongly reaffirms its full support for the Special Commission in the conduct of its inspections and the other tasks entrusted to it by the Council. The Security Council reiterates the importance it attaches to full compliance by Iraq with the relevant resolutions of the Council. It underlines the important role of the Special Commission's inspection teams and demands once again that they be given immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to any and all areas, facilities, equipment, records and means of transportation which they wish to inspect, and Iraqi officials whom they wish to interview, so that the Special Commission may fully discharge its mandate.

"In this context, the Security Council remains gravely concerned at the failure by Iraq to comply fully with its resolution 1060 (1996) of 12 June 1996 and with other resolutions of the Council dealing with the Special Commission. The denial by Iraq, on repeated occasions, of immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to sites which they wished to inspect and the attempts made by the Government of Iraq to impose conditions on the conduct of interviews with Iraqi officials by the Special Commission constitute a gross violation of its obligations under resolutions 687 (1991), 707 (1991) and 715 (1991). The Council notes that these actions also contradict commitments made by the Government of Iraq in its Joint Statement of 22 June 1996 with the Special Commission, and urges the Government of Iraq to respect these commitments. The Council reminds the Government of Iraq that only full compliance with its obligations under the relevant resolutions will enable the Executive Chairman of the Special Commission to present his report in accordance with Section C of Resolution 687 (1991). The Council will continue to consider how best to ensure Iraq's full compliance.

"The Security Council requests the Executive Chairman to report to it on the results of his visit."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/1996/36.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda. The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 10.50 a.m.

United Nations S/PV.3692

Security Council

Fifty-first Year

Provisional

3692nd Meeting

Wednesday, 28 August 1996, 10.30 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Eitel	(Germany)
Members:	Botswana	Mr. Nkgowe
	Chile	Mr. Somavía
	China	Mr. He Yafei
	Egypt	Mr. Abdel Aziz
	France	Mr. Ladsous
	Guinea-Bissau	Mr. Lopes Cabral
	Honduras	Mr. Martínez Blanco
	Indonesia	Mr. Wisnumurti
	Italy	Mr. Fulci
	Poland	Mr. Matuszewski
	Republic of Korea	Mr. Park
	Russian Federation	Mr. Fedotov
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Gomersall
	United States of America	Mr. Inderfurth

Agenda

The situation in Burundi

Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Burundi (S/1996/660)

96-86124 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Burundi

Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Burundi (S/1996/660)

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Australia, Belgium, Burundi, Canada, Ireland, Japan, South Africa, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nsanze (Burundi) took a seat at the Council table; Mr. Rowe (Australia), Mr. Wouters (Belgium), Mr. Karsgaard (Canada), Mr. Murphy (Ireland), Mr. Konishi (Japan), Mr. Jele (South Africa), Mr. Mukasa-Ssali (Uganda) and Mr. Nkurlu (United Republic of Tanzania) took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Burundi, document S/1996/660.

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the following other documents: S/1996/628, note by the Secretary-General circulating a letter dated 5 August 1996 from the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity addressed to the Secretary-General; S/1996/682, letter dated 25 July 1996 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council, transmitting the final report of the International Commission of Inquiry for Burundi; S/1996/620, letter dated 2 August 1996 from the Permanent Representative of the United Republic of Tanzania to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/1996/651, letter dated 7 August 1996 from the Chargé d'affaires *ad interim* of the Permanent Mission of Kenya to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; S/1996/673, letter dated 19 August 1996 from the Chargé d'affaires *ad interim* of the Permanent Mission of Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General; and S/1996/690, letter dated 25 August 1996 from the Permanent Representative of Burundi to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.

The first speaker is the representative of Burundi, on whom I now call.

Mr. Nsanze (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): A century will soon have passed since the opening of relations between Burundi and Germany. To this day, they have not been clouded in any way, and we are gratified by that. Even if a Persian proverb states that politeness benefits more the person who extends it than the person who receives it, your exquisite courtesy and your diplomatic professionalism warrant our admiration, and we are delighted to see you presiding over this organ.

During the month of July, Ambassador Alain Dejammet presided over the work of the Security Council. Aware as I am of his great modesty, and as he is not here now, I welcome the opportunity to commend him and his delegation for the skilful and realistic way in which they carried out their mandate, reflecting the very intelligent policies of France.

After the new regime came to power, a summit held at Arusha by the countries of the Great Lakes region decreed general economic sanctions against Burundi. That is the main reason for the request addressed to the President of the Security Council on 25 August 1996 for the convening of an urgent meeting of the Security Council on this matter.

The delegation of Burundi, for the purposes of the Security Council, must highlight the main factors militating against this overall strangulation, to the detriment of an innocent people. This statement will address four factors: first, the national imperatives in favour of a change in government; secondly, the haste to use coercive measures; thirdly, the clear illegality and

immorality of the economic embargo; and, fourthly and lastly, the devastating consequences for the people of Burundi.

First I shall outline the particulars of national imperatives favouring the changes that took place on 25 July 1996.

Over the last three years, a coalition of global dimensions emerged with a view to averting a genocide in Burundi similar to or on the pattern of the one that befell Rwanda. In order to save Burundi from this disaster, the Security Council made enormous efforts. The Secretary-General envisaged various alternatives. The Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the European Union mobilized great human, diplomatic and financial resources. Non-governmental, intergovernmental and humanitarian organizations made efforts and provided means, and the international media kept world public opinion constantly alert to the apocalyptic danger to the survival of the people of Burundi. In spite of this worldwide crusade, the country moved inexorably towards the feared apocalypse, and the former regime proved powerless to save a nation in peril. The daily massacres taking place under the very eyes of that paralysed power were testimony of this.

If democracy can be understood as government for the well-being of the people, the former system had failed completely in its primary mission: to save the people from extermination. This sad reality was often evoked in a series of reports by the Secretary-General, including the most recent, S/1996/660 of 15 August 1996, which deals mainly with the state of affairs before the fateful date of 25 July 1996.

In the face of a tragedy as explosive as ours, there was desperation in all quarters over the possibility of saving our shipwrecked nation. The President having abdicated and his Prime Minister having been forced to follow in his wake, a headless State resulted. Here I refer again to page 4 of the report of the Secretary-General of 15 August. The emergence of the new regime responded to paramount national imperatives. Should the new and august assembly embrace the defenders of a regime that not only had failed but was unable to save an entire people in the pit of hell and implacably condemned to genocide?

A legitimate and an inevitable question arose: is it reasonable and responsible to support a political system when a population is being decimated day by day? Is that system still a democracy? The Government before 25 July 1996 had not resulted from elections; it was merely the outcome of the Convention on Governance concluded by 12 political parties; it was called upon to govern the State of Burundi during a transitional period, since it was impossible for the victorious party to govern alone because of the genocide attributed to its members in 1993-1994, as can be seen from the report of the International Commission of Inquiry.

Would it really have been politically wise to allow Burundi to succumb to total and definitive implosion under a democracy that had become but a shadow of its former self, or was it imperative to throw a life-line to the people of Burundi? The latter alternative proved necessary in order to avoid genocide and to provide a powerful springboard to a new democratic process. Would it really have been sound to accommodate a Government doomed to reign over the ruins or the ashes of a nation?

Secondly, there is the haste of coercive measures. At the moment, the motives of our neighbouring countries remain unknown and, at best, are open to interpretation. However stealthily they are concealed, the measures taken against Burundi have been dictated by unavowed objectives. A minimum of realism and political wisdom requires that we allow the new regime to succeed or fail in its own development towards elective democracy, as has been the case in countries of the region and throughout the world. In the governmental programme, President Pierre Buyoya has already solemnly and explicitly committed the new regime to putting an end to all forms of violence and criminality, working for peace and lasting security, eradicating impunity, spawning a new democratic process and confirming the mission conferred upon Mwalimu Julius Nyerere in his mediation aimed at bringing the different parties to the conflict together at the negotiating table.

Towards that end, President Buyoya has personally carried out two visits in three weeks to President Nyerere in order to urge him to reactivate his mission. Along the same lines, Burundi has proposed the convening and holding of a regional summit devoted to the overall crisis. It has begun talks even with the armed factions that are determined to lay down their weapons and to divorce themselves from Nazi ideologies of extermination and genocide. In keeping with this new political and democratic dynamic, consultations are already under way with a view to the establishment of a transitional national assembly. All the deputies of the former National Assembly will be members, together with certain representatives of civil society and of other socio-political

sectors, with a view to adapting the Parliament to national realities. This new assembly will be convened in a regular session in the month of October. In the same context, the national debate that both Burundi and the Security Council have fervently called for is scheduled for the month of November. As for political parties, a new law and other mechanisms will be specifically studied and decided upon by that national assembly.

Given this impressive series of measures taken in record time and aimed at preventing genocide and strengthening the chances of genuine pluralistic democracy, we can well wonder about the sense of these hasty coercive measures. Undoubtedly, under the influence of the economic blockade under way — which is already a nightmare for the nation of Burundi — certain actors are trying to level another mortal blow: a *coup de grâce* intended to deprive Burundi by an arms embargo, of the shield normally provided by the national army, as though the economic blockade were not overwhelming enough. Such a development would place the population in the hands of armed terrorists of all types, who, skilled in lawlessness and in clandestine behaviour, would not submit to any prohibition on weapons.

This measure would be a great boon for them, because it would make it impossible for the Government to equip itself for the benefit of all the people of Burundi. Burundi, however, proposes that the Security Council consider a more realistic, more constructive and more productive alternative. From this perspective, a diplomatic dynamic involving an ad hoc mission to the States of the Great Lakes region, including Burundi, would make it possible for the Security Council better to understand the ins and outs of the overall problem. The facts having been provided by the source itself, it would be infinitely easier for the Security Council to provide solutions based on existing realities.

There is a strange reasoning that upholds the economic blockade as a way to force the political actors to negotiate. This pretext cannot stand, since the new regime has, from the very beginning, publicly asked that dialogue be organized between all groups, including the armed factions, as long as they renounce the repugnant practices of violence, extermination and genocide.

In spite of the standstill, and even setbacks, in the negotiations under the former Government, no embargo was imposed on it. Is it therefore conceivable that the fact that it was impossible to resolve the conflict under the former Government is being blamed on a regime which is resolved and able to remedy the failings of the former governmental group?

Is it logically and politically justifiable that the new regime be forced to atone for the sins committed by political leaders deposed for having failed at their national mandate? It is important for the Security Council to consider whether the hasty economic sanctions are well founded. Even if the actors involved in our region had doubts as to the true intentions of the new Burundian authorities, the negotiations required a minimum period of time devoted to specifying negotiable points, to approving an agenda, to determining practical modalities, to identifying negotiators and to the forming of the delegations of the various groups that are parties to the conflict. The result is that the true motives that inspired the initial and principal authors of this extreme punishment against Burundi have nothing to do with the well-being of Burundi's people. *Onus probandi incumbit actori*: the burden of proof rests on he who makes a legal or material allegation. In this case, the obligation to prove that the regime currently in place is not really aiming for a general improvement of the socio-political landscape falls to the authors of the economic embargo against Burundi.

Thirdly, as regards the clear illegality and immorality of the economic blockade against Burundi, an utterly specious interpretation tends to support the thesis according to which each State is authorized to exercise the discretionary right to decree measures such as those that have now been decided upon against Burundi. Such an idea confuses the ability to accept or refuse economic relations between States with the right to inflict on third States arbitrary coercive measures. International law explicitly and strongly prohibits giving one State the right to determine the life or death of another. According to this thesis, no State is legally authorized to block or to reroute cargo or merchandise from and/or to third States. In application of this rule of international law, while they are not obliged to do business or to communicate with our country, Burundi's neighbours are in no way authorized to confiscate or to intercept its merchandise ordered by or destined for other countries. They do so at the risk of committing interference in its internal affairs, in flagrant violation of inter-State conventions and treaties.

At this point, may I cite an article by a professor at Brussels University that appeared in *Libre Belgique* today, 28 August. It states, "In fact, this measure is politically laughable." This embargo is politically

laughable, according to Professor Eric David, a specialist in international law at the Université Libre of Brussels, since it is being imposed on Burundi because Burundi has not been democratic since three weeks ago. From a legal standpoint, this embargo is a form of intervention in Burundi's internal affairs, a type of intervention that has been prohibited since the 1970s by the United Nations. The Professor explains that the United Nations could transgress this prohibition if the country targeted by intervention had been officially classified as a threat to international peace and security. Yet Burundi has not committed such a crime, as I will prove in a moment by referring to the Charters of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and of the United Nations.

As will be shown, the Charter of the United Nations is gravely violated by the ordering of economic sanctions against Burundi. Indeed, judging by their nature and their excessive gravity, they are identical to those stipulated in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Under the terms of Article 39 of the Charter, such sanctions can be imposed on a Member State of the Organization only when such a State has been guilty of a grave threat to the peace, a breach of peace or an act of aggression. The breaking of economic relations and the interruption of various forms of communication by virtue of Article 41 of the Charter are in no way justified in the case of our country, since it has not attacked any other State or threatened the peace anywhere in the region that has saddled it with sanctions.

Even supposing that a country deserved the economic sanctions recommended in Article 41 of the Charter, their imposition requires prior authorization by the Security Council, under the terms of Article 53 of the Charter. I quote:

> "no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council".

An exception is made in the case of a State that was an enemy of the signatories of the Charter. But as Burundi was not yet a sovereign State during the Second World War, it was not an enemy to any signatory of the Charter.

Fourthly, as regards the pervasive disillusionment over the well-foundedness of neighbourliness and natural solidarity, under the pretext that these sanctions are decreed by Africans, and thus by brothers and neighbours of Burundi to boot, some States are tempted either to resign themselves to a *fait accompli* or to take a wait-and-see approach. Either position is a failure to live up to the responsibilities devolved to the Security Council.

The omnipresent thesis that this economic blockade is all the more outrageous, disturbing and unforgivable because it comes from Africans, brothers and neighbours, is eminently plausible. Such a vision is as sound as it is rational, for these brothers and neighbours should have been the first to show their eagerness to care for and their solidarity with a full-fledged member of their regional family — in short, to try to bind the wounds of Burundi in such trying times. If the situation were reversed, Burundi would find it eternally repugnant to take advantage of the misfortunes and trials of a brotherly African people, whether near or far, to declare economic war.

There are many factors to support the thesis that the economic embargo against Burundi can be described only as economic aggression. A grave attack on peace, as specified in Article 39 of the Charter, is in evidence. It is up to the Security Council, if it is not to fail in its role, to fully exercise the responsibility assigned to it under Article 24, paragraph 1, of the Charter, that of the "maintenance of international peace and security". By virtue of legal logic, and under the terms of international law, the measures contained in Article 41 of the Charter should be reversed, because they are, on the contrary, deserved by the countries having initiated the blockade against a State that is innocent from every point of view, according to the spirit and the letter of Article 39 of the Charter.

The Convention on the Law of the Sea has also been violated, since it stipulates the right of States to passage through the territorial waters of coastal States. That same Convention also stipulates, in part X, articles 124 through 132, the right of land-locked States to access to and from the sea and freedom of transit.

Fifthly, and lastly, we have the cruel consequences of the economic blockade on the entire people of Burundi.

Before the new regime came to power, many political and humanitarian initiatives were being taken in our region at the governmental level, as well as by facilitators, in order to save the people of Burundi from the disaster of genocide. Since the assumption of power by a Government that is infinitely more able to work towards saving the nation, and therefore to dispel the sense of impending danger, those same actors in the

region have been joining together to decree collective death for the Burundi people. How can we understand this colossal and alarming paradox? Yesterday, the prevention of genocide was the priority objective of those States and other main actors. What we are talking about is the difference between genocide by firearms and hand-to-hand weapons and possible genocide by Draconian economic sanctions.

If we underscore the cumulative factors and the multiplication of effects, the Security Council and the international community will be able to gauge the immense gravity of the economic blockade.

Firstly, coffee is Burundi's main export product. The great majority of farmers produce only coffee. The embargo makes it impossible for them to distribute their only income-generating product abroad. It is the rural farming population that is affected, not the Government.

Secondly, there is the impending health crisis. A statement was made by the national doctors' association the day before yesterday to the effect that deadly illnesses are imminent because it is impossible to obtain medical supplies or instruments or to use operating rooms for the seriously ill.

Thirdly, there is also a dangerous aggravation of an economy already severely tried by a crisis that has persisted for three years now.

Fourthly, we are faced with the disastrous consequences for hundreds of thousands of displaced and repatriated persons.

Finally, there exist the combined deadly effects of being land-locked and having economic sanctions imposed on the population.

In the face of this paralysing economic strangulation, decreed unilaterally by our neighbours, which should be cultivating natural human solidarity more than ever with a Burundi immersed in a state of distress, we are once again threatened with genocide, the causes of which everyone is seeking to eradicate, but which could re-emerge owing to those measures that run counter to legal and humanitarian principles.

In this statement I have underscored the clear way in which these economic sanctions violate the Charter of the United Nations, the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, the African Charter of Human Rights, the Convention on the Law of the Sea and traditional international law.

Even if all those treaties were non-existent, the Security Council would have to establish ad hoc mechanisms and solutions if it were not to be held responsible before history for endorsing this steamroller that is in the process of crushing the people of Burundi. Many of the States members of the Security Council have distinguished themselves as champions of humanitarian ideals. Would they be crowned with glory if they were to endorse or allow the gratuitous immolation of the entire people of Burundi?

The accession to power of the new regime through special channels and because of national imperatives was required because of the need for a historic act of patriotism to save a people about to vanish into the darkness. The path taken by Burundi in endorsing this change of regime to lead the State is not a unique exception to democracy. The democratic ideal has an abundance of flaws, in form and substance in the world, in Africa and in our region, in both practice and in principle. None the less, out of total respect for the democratic choices that have been made in other countries and for the sacrosanct sovereignty of States, Burundi strictly refrains from expressing any criticism of them whatsoever.

By virtue of this code of conduct, which is inspired specifically by democracy and by international law as reflected in the Charter of the United Nations and that of the Organization of African Unity, my country refrains from interfering in the internal affairs of other Governments and from taking upon itself the right to threaten or to impose on them any type of sanctions on any pretext or on the basis of some unsolicited and one-sided quixotic spirit. At this stage the question arises as to whether Burundi, either today or in the future, will be able to reciprocate by taking coercive measures against any of those States if certain democratic principles or practices are dispensed with there.

In conclusion, in the name of certain noble doctrines or ideals, some champions of this devastating embargo against the people of Burundi have publicly and energetically come out against similar measures adopted or announced by Powers outside of Africa. Some Africans that in the past have condemned the sponsors of economic sanctions from the West are today the most zealous advocates of the same evil that before they denounced. Some Western States, if they join in

decreeing this crushing embargo, might even find themselves the target of the anger of the champions of the embargo. One adores the god that one immolated the day before.

One day in the courtyard of the Temple Jesus was surrounded by an enormous crowd. The scribes and the Pharisees, wanting to show their zeal for socio-religious puritanism, brought before Jesus Christ a woman who had been accused of adultery, claiming that such women in such a situation should be stoned, according to the Law of Moses. They wanted to set a trap for Jesus so that they could then bring accusations against him on the basis of this travesty. After deep reflection, and with his unfailing honesty, he made the following clear-cut statement. "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her." *(The Holy Bible, Saint John the Apostle 8:7)*

The President: I thank the representative of Burundi for the kind words he addressed to my predecessor and to me.

Let me remind speakers that the Council has agreed on a new practice according to which speakers are encouraged to forgo the expression of compliments at the beginning of their statements.

The next speaker is the representative of Ireland. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Murphy (Ireland): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union. The following associated countries — Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia — align themselves with this statement. Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway have also aligned themselves with this statement.

The European Union has followed closely the evolving situation in Burundi. It has expressed its deep concern at the disturbing developments there, most recently on 19 August 1996. We have taken the opportunity of this debate today to call on all sides to stop the violence and to commit themselves to, and work actively towards, a negotiated and peaceful resolution of the crisis.

The European Union supports the efforts of the regional leaders, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the former President of Tanzania, Mr. Julius Nyerere, to assist Burundi to overcome peacefully the grave crisis that it is experiencing. We encourage them to continue their efforts to facilitate the search for a political solution. The European Union has recently appointed a Special Envoy for the Great Lakes region, Mr. Aldo Ajello, to assist in the search for such a solution.

The report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Burundi documents fully and clearly the enormity and seriousness of the political and humanitarian situation in Burundi. All steps must be taken to ensure that there is no further loss of life.

In this context, the European Union considers it essential for a dialogue to be organized without delay, bringing together all of Burundi's political forces without exception, including representatives of civil organizations, in order to negotiate a democratic, institutional consensus capable of ensuring security for all.

Only when all sections of society are able to participate freely and fully in the principal institutions and bodies of the State can national reconciliation and peace be restored on a lasting basis. As the Secretary-General has said, the conflict in Burundi is not susceptible to a military solution. Political mechanisms have to be found to share power in a way that will allay the fears of both sides and gradually build up the confidence that will enable them to live in harmony. We fully endorse this view.

The European Union urges all sides in Burundi to call an immediate cease-fire. The process of reconciliation cannot begin as long as acts of violence, which continue unabated, are perpetrated. The safety of all Burundians must be fully respected. We remain utterly convinced that violence cannot provide the answer to the crisis in Burundi. Only the inclusive dialogue that the international community and the regional leaders have called for is capable of achieving this. The guarantees that both communities in Burundi require can emerge only from a process that includes all sections of society.

We do not underestimate the complexity of the task ahead. Political exploitation of animosity and suspicion between the various communities in Burundi have made it much more difficult to find a common ground on which to begin to build the process of reconciliation. A new relationship based on trust and on confidence must be established. To this end, the prevailing culture of impunity needs to be properly addressed. Each side must find the confidence to compromise enough so as to reconcile its often conflicting interests. The willingness

to engage in dialogue is almost the most basic test of political responsibility; the willingness to cast aside inflexible positions is the test of political courage.

The European Union and its member States have made significant contributions at both the multilateral and the bilateral level to alleviate the plight of the people of Burundi. The Union reaffirms its willingness to support Burundi's recovery efforts, once the necessary national reconciliation is embarked upon with all the resolve required.

The European Union wishes to reiterate the utmost importance that it attaches to the prompt and satisfactory resolution of the situation of those who have sought protection in European Union and other foreign missions in Bujumbura.

The European Union believes that today's debate in the Security Council will serve to underline the concern of the international community at the seriousness of the situation in Burundi. It will also show the support for the very considerable efforts of the regional leaders, the OAU and former President Nyerere to restore the basic democratic institutions in Burundi and to relaunch the process of dialogue between the various parties. We believe that a very clear signal has gone out to all sides in the Burundi conflict. There must be an end to all violence. There must be a beginning, without delay, to all-inclusive dialogue. This is the only path to the lasting solution we all seek, a solution based on a negotiated democratic and institutional consensus, which ensures security for all.

The President: The next speaker is the representative of Belgium. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Wouters (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): Belgium would like to concur with the statement by the Permanent Representative of Ireland, who spoke on behalf of the European Union.

Belgium remains deeply concerned by the situation in Burundi. The recent *coup d'état* was rejected by the international community. Aware of the possible regional repercussions of the Burundian crisis, Belgium, like its European partners, welcomes the diplomatic action taken by the Heads of State of the region to help Burundi overcome peacefully the serious crisis it is now going through, and encourages them to continue their efforts to facilitate the quest for a negotiated political solution.

Belgium would like to avail itself of the occasion of this Security Council debate to express its support for the regional leaders, for the Organization of African Unity and for the former President of Tanzania, Mr. Julius Nyerere, for the efforts they have been making to help Burundi in its quest for peace. We would appeal to all the parties in Burundi to cooperate fully and constructively in these efforts.

Belgium calls for the immediate cessation of all acts of violence in Burundi, regardless of who its perpetrator might be. It calls for an immediate and unconditional cease-fire between the warring parties in Burundi.

A cease-fire is the first step in the process of national reconciliation and the reconstruction of the country. It is only by respecting the security of all Burundians that peace can be restored to that country. The peace process will then require dialogue and the initiation of talks that would include all political forces without exception. If this dialogue is to be fruitful and if a lasting civil peace in Burundi is to be restored, Belgium believes it essential that the National Assembly and the parties should play a role in the reconciliation process.

To that end, the political leaders should shoulder their responsibilities as quickly as possible and show a sense of statesmanship and democratic resolve.

Belgium, together with its European partners, considers itself to be committed to this political process that is to lead Burundi to peace. The Government has contributed both financially and materially to the various initiatives launched by the Organization of African Unity and by President Nyerere. Belgium remains prepared to make substantial contributions to any economic reconstruction effort once peace has been restored to Burundi.

The President: The next speaker is the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Nkurlu (United Republic of Tanzania): Allow me at the outset to extend to you my delegation's congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of August. It is a pleasure to see the manner in which you have been discharging the heavy responsibilities entrusted to this Council. We equally pay tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador

Alain Dejammet of France, who did remarkable work in guiding the deliberations of the Council last month.

Sharing a common border with Burundi, my country has over the years witnessed this endemic problem simmer until it reached a cruel and destructive ethnic violence, claiming the lives of thousands of innocent men, women and children, destroying property and causing massive numbers of refugees and displaced people. This situation has not only brought misery, insecurity, instability and a sense of pessimism to the subregion, it has also caused ecological and environmental damage to the area.

Most conflicts of this nature transcend borders, and our border is no exception. My country has been adversely affected by this conflict, both socially and economically. Thus, the positive developments of July 1993, when Burundi, under a multi-party democracy, elected Melchior Ndadaye President, were followed with keen interest, optimism and relief in Tanzania. The Government, and indeed the people of Tanzania were delighted that at long last there was a permanent solution in the neighbourhood.

The present report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Burundi, contained in document S/1996/660, emphasizes the culmination of the brutal 1993 assassination of President Ndadaye and the subsequent massacres only a few months after power changed hands. The political maturity displayed during and after the general elections by Pierre Buyoya, who gracefully handed over power to the victor, was unceremoniously shattered once again, giving way to a difficult situation which has left the country fragmented and has compounded the problem of mistrust among conflicting parties.

We are all aware of the concerted efforts made by former President Julius Nyerere to engage the Burundi political parties in dialogue in an endeavour to find a lasting solution to the problems in the country. The report of the Secretary-General aptly points out that President Nyerere's efforts were undermined by some factions inside and outside Burundi, in spite of the support he enjoyed from President Ntibantunganya, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the international community at large.

It is against this backdrop that the coup of July 25, 1996 has to be condemned in the strongest terms, as it has deliberately reversed the democratic process in the country, basically returning Burundi to its state prior to the 1993 elections. Any attempt to condone this coup will send the wrong signal to the current regime in Burundi and to the international community in general. We should be categorical and send a clear message that, whatever the circumstances, any coup is illegal and, in any case, it is an outmoded and obsolete way of assuming political power.

Talking to the press in Windhoek last week, President Benjamin Mkapa rightly observed,

> "the issue of derailing the Burundi democratic process and peace negotiations was not only a matter of concern to the East and Central African region, but also to the entire world community."

We have every reason to be concerned with the turn of events in Burundi, which have jeopardized the democratic process and the peace process. Our greatest fear is the further deterioration of the situation into a full-fledged civil war with tragic and disastrous consequences.

My delegation, at this juncture, would like to express its satisfaction and total support for all the decisions taken during the Arusha regional summit on 31 July 1996 which, among other things, decided to impose economic sanctions on Burundi and appealed to the international community to support its decisions. We fully subscribe to the objectives of the sanctions, which are aimed at restoring constitutional order and at creating conditions for genuine negotiations encompassing all parties to the conflict, in accordance with principles and objectives enshrined in the first Arusha regional summit. Members of the Council will recall that the Arusha "peace plan", which emphasizes democracy and security for all the people of Burundi, was endorsed by the Organization of African Unity summit in Yaoundé.

Let me take this opportunity to reiterate and underscore the salient decisions unanimously agreed to at the Arusha summit. First, the Bujumbura regime should immediately undertake specific measures aimed at returning constitutional order, including the immediate restoration of the National Assembly, which is a democratic institution of legality that has derived its mandate from the Burundi people, and the immediate unbanning of political parties in the country. Secondly, the regime should undertake immediate and unconditional negotiations with all the parties to the conflict. These negotiations should include parties and armed factions inside and outside the country. Thirdly, the framework of these negotiations should be the Mwanza process, reinforced by the Arusha peace initiative, under the

auspices of Mwalimu Nyerere, which seeks to guarantee security and democracy for all the Burundi people.

A misguided concept is currently being floated by the Bujumbura regime that the Arusha decisions, especially the imposition of sanctions, are interference in the sovereignty and internal affairs of Burundi. We are firmly of the view that these decisions are the only viable means to assist the people of Burundi to settle their differences amicably. We therefore call upon the Buyoya regime to make a deliberate and genuine move to fully implement the demands of the second Arusha summit in order to pave the way for peace negotiations to commence.

Tanzania would once again like to appeal to the international community, especially to the members of the Security Council, to support the regional efforts on sanctions on Burundi since it is the only viable way of restoring constitutional order in the country. These sanctions are meant to shape the future prosperity of the people of Burundi. They are meant to articulate the fundamental principles of democracy in the country and, above all, they are meant to stop genocide by asking the Buyoya regime to retrace its footsteps to constitutional governance.

The President: I thank the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania for his kind words addressed to my predecessor and to myself.

Let me remind speakers that the Council has agreed upon a new practice, according to which speakers are encouraged to forgo the expression of compliments at the beginning of their statements.

The next speaker is the representative of Canada. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Karsgaard (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): Canada has deplored the military takeover that contravened the constitutional and legal institutions of Burundi. A forcible takeover is no substitute for dialogue between all the factions and parties involved to restore social and political peace to a country. The Honourable Lloyd Axworthy, Canada's Minister for Foreign Affairs, has stated that such an act will never solve Burundi's long-term problems. Only a new political agreement, respectful of democratic principles and minority rights, will help solve them. Canada fully subscribes to the constant efforts of Burundi's neighbours to promote effective negotiations between all the Burundian parties concerned.

For many months, Canada has been striving to encourage a peaceful, lasting solution to the disputes rampant in central Africa's Great Lakes region. We support the noble mediation and facilitation efforts undertaken by Mr. Julius Nyerere, former President of Tanzania. Last June, Canada's Prime Minister appealed to the region's Heads of State to do everything they could to find a peaceful, lasting solution to the region's political and social problems.

(*spoke in English*)

The takeover of 25 July put an abrupt end to efforts designed only to support the institutions which the Burundian people freely acquired in a transparent and democratic manner. In 1992 and 1993, the Burundian people spoke loudly and clearly; now, three years later, the army is again trying to silence them.

Canada is very pleased to see that the region's leaders stand behind the core principles that must underlie the management of a government and the search for solutions to political disputes.

Canada fully supports the firm, courageous stance taken by the Heads of State in Arusha last 31 July. The entire region clearly desires to see the new authorities now in Burundi take the route of negotiation and respect for the democratic principles that we all share. We are pleased that the Security Council is considering additional steps it might take in support of this outcome.

The attacks by both sides on innocent civilians must cease. We must turn towards the future if we are to overcome the difficulties of the past. Sectarian interests must give way to the legitimate interests and concerns of the Burundian people at large. As part of Canada's collective and unanimous support for the efforts of Mr. Nyerere, Canada's Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for la francophonie chaired a meeting last June in Geneva involving interested contributors and the Burundian authorities. The purpose of the meeting was to help develop the outlines of a transitional economic-assistance plan for Burundi, to be implemented once peace is restored.

(*spoke in French*)

It is worth repeating here what the Honourable Pierre Pettigrew's stated recently:

"like other donor countries, Canada is quite prepared to support the reconstruction of Burundi. However, this can only be done in a climate of political stability and peace. There must first be negotiations. Canada joins with the countries of the region and demands that a dialogue for peace be initiated immediately."

While it is for Burundi to find its own course in dignity and freedom, the whole international community must join with the region in declaring, with one voice, enough is enough.

The President: The next speaker is the representative of Australia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Rowe (Australia): This open debate presents a timely opportunity to examine the situation in Burundi and how the international community can respond effectively to recent developments there.

Australia is seriously concerned about recent developments in Burundi. It holds grave fears that unless the parties to the conflict, with the support of the international community, can reach a negotiated settlement, the cycle of violence will escalate, causing violence and bloodshed on a horrific scale and further upheaval and human misery throughout Burundi and the Great Lakes region.

We urge all sectors of Burundi's population to engage in constructive dialogue to bring about a peaceful, durable solution to the conflict in Burundi and to achieve, without delay, the restoration of democratic institutions and processes.

In particular, Australia calls upon all sides to exercise restraint, thereby creating an environment which allows for their fears to be put aside and for the restoration of confidence throughout the community. Australia urges the parties to the conflict to recognize that continued violence will not bring peace to Burundi.

Australia commends the efforts of countries in the region to find ways to restore peace and democracy in Burundi. My Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Alexander Downer, attended the Organization of African Unity (OAU) summit in Yaoundé from 8-10 July 1996, as a guest. He was impressed by the determination of African leaders to work for a solution to the situation in Burundi.

In welcoming the regional initiative, the Australian Government emphasizes the importance of implementing measured responses which, as well as seeking to bring about a political solution, ensure that the basic needs of the population can be met.

Unimpeded provision of, and access to, humanitarian assistance is imperative if the situation in Burundi is to be stabilized. Further human displacement will have serious ramifications for peace and security throughout the Great Lakes region and its prevention must be regarded as a priority by the international community. Should further upheaval lead to an exodus of refugees from Burundi, the international community must be prepared to come to their assistance.

Australia continues to support the Mwanza peace process, facilitated by former Tanzanian President Nyerere, and urges the parties involved to resume negotiations under this process. While the hurdles are significant, the mediation efforts of Mr. Nyerere must be given every chance to succeed, representing as they do the most realistic opportunity for pursuing dialogue between the key players. The momentum towards peace established during the early stages of the Mwanza peace process must not be lost.

If intervention by outside parties is left as the only means to prevent a slide into anarchy and genocide, there is an obligation upon Members of the United Nations to see that the objectives of such action are clearly defined and that the means of achieving them are sufficient and well prepared. With that contingency in mind, the Secretary-General must continue, in conjunction with the OAU, to plan for the prevention of another humanitarian disaster, an outcome which the international community is not prepared to countenance.

Australia has sought to play a modest but constructive role in efforts to resolve the present crisis in Burundi and to assist in the process of peace-building in the wider region. To this end, we have contributed financially to the Nyerere peace initiative, to the peace fund of the OAU Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution, and to the International Peace Academy Conflict Management in Africa Programme.

The Council must not become complacent over Burundi. It is imperative not only that it monitor the situation there but that it continue its efforts to examine

how best to encourage all sides in Burundi to work together for an enduring political settlement.

The President: The next speaker is the representative of South Africa. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Jele (South Africa): My delegation would like to thank you, Mr President, for convening this meeting, which provides us with an opportunity to voice our concern at the disturbing turn of events in Burundi.

The report of the Secretary-General sketches a very disturbing picture of the situation in Burundi, which is bedevilled by strife and ethnic conflict of immeasurable dimensions. The international community has become accustomed to hearing of the most atrocious of deeds and of a total disregard for human life.

The ordinary men and women in Burundi have no way of knowing whether the first rays of a new dawn will bring hope or signal the beginning of more tyranny. It is for this reason that my delegation is very concerned about the recent military coup in Burundi and believes it is bound to delay the realization of an early solution to the conflict.

We in Southern Africa have lived under and succeeded in overcoming the scourge of apartheid. This achievement was facilitated by the unyielding support of the international community to complement our efforts. We therefore concur with the report of the Secretary-General that the gross disregard for the rule of law and the contempt for constitutional and elected organs by those who carried out the coup is not conducive to the creation of conditions to achieve lasting peace but will

> "reinforce the fears of one side and strengthen extremists on both sides. It will increase violence and add to the suffering of Burundian" *(S/1996/660, para. 47)*

The international community can no longer allow acts of unbridled violence to continue with impunity. Those who commit serious violations of international humanitarian law should be made to realize that they are individually responsible for such violations and will be held accountable.

My Government also agrees with the observation in the report that the complexities of the Burundian conflict require, in the first instance, political dialogue and solution. Military intervention should be considered only as a last resort if the situation deteriorates drastically. In this regard my delegation supports fully the Arusha initiative and the Mwanza peace process of Mwalimu Julius Nyerere, which includes the imposition of sanctions against the Buyoya regime. We see sanctions as a means to achieve the political resolution of the conflict and not as an instrument of punishment. It is our belief that sanctions are the most effective and appropriate means of pressing for a speedy end to the strife in Burundi.

These initiatives can only help to save Burundi from further carnage and create conditions conducive to the restoration of legal constitutional institutions. We believe that the resumption of an all-inclusive negotiation process without preconditions will serve to ensure peace and security for all the people of Burundi.

The momentum gained by sanctions and other efforts of the countries in the Great Lakes region should not be lost. It is important that the international community act in unison with the region by giving support to efforts already in place and by ensuring that a process of dialogue aimed at establishing a comprehensive political settlement is achieved.

It is the sincere hope of my delegation that the sanctions being applied to Burundi will lead the parties to the negotiating table and that the deployment of a peace-keeping operation or an intervention force under Chapter VII of the Charter will not become a necessity. The international community must act, and act now, to bring about peace and end the cycle of violence in Burundi.

The President: The next speaker is the representative of Uganda. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Mukasa-Ssali (Uganda): We welcome the opportunity to participate in the debate on the situation in Burundi, a sister country torn by conflict and civil strife.

As the Council is well aware, the leaders of the Great Lakes subregion have met on several occasions to work out an acceptable and peaceful resolution to the conflict in Burundi.

Throughout all these meetings, the leaders have reiterated their opposition to resorting to unconstitutional means to resolve the problems of Burundi and warned that they would not accept any government that comes to power through such means. Sadly, subsequent events in Burundi did not occur in accordance with our

recommendations and advice, but instead the army moved in to grab power from democratically elected leaders.

Uganda, as well as its sister States in the subregion, unequivocally condemned the putschists in Burundi and demanded a speedy return to constitutional governance.

The Security Council is also aware that we have imposed sanctions on Burundi as a result of the coup. The sanctions, however, are not meant to punish but rather to encourage the leadership in Bujumbura to undertake urgently measures aimed at restoring constitutional order in the country. The sanctions are also aimed at encouraging all parties to the conflict in Burundi to hold unconditional negotiations within the framework of the Mwanza peace process, reinforced by the Arusha peace initiative under the auspices of Mwalimu Julius Nyerere, as a first step towards guaranteeing security and democracy for all the people of Burundi. In this regard, the leadership in Burundi must, first, restore and work with the national Parliament and, secondly, lift the ban on and work with the various political parties.

The unfortunate victims of the conflict in Burundi have often times been innocent civilians caught in the middle of this situation. Uganda condemns, therefore, in the strongest terms the killing of innocent and unarmed civilians. This, to us, is unacceptable. We demand that both parties to the conflict halt immediately the killings and massacres of innocent civilians.

The regional leaders have declared their readiness and preparedness to cooperate fully with the United Nations to make appropriate contributions towards the adoption of measures aimed at avoiding a catastrophe in Burundi in the event of further deterioration of the situation and to redress tendencies that would aggravate the conflict in Burundi. In this context, we would like to underscore the importance of closer cooperation and better coordination between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU), as well as with the countries of the region.

Finally, Uganda believes that the people of Burundi must realize that they have to learn to be tolerant of each other and to live together in harmony, as they all have a right to live in Burundi and to fully participate in its economic, social and political life as equal citizens. A political, rather than military formula, will bring them closer to that goal.

The President: The next speaker is the representative of Japan. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Konishi (Japan): Like previous speakers, we have followed the situation in Burundi with apprehension, and we welcome this opportunity to discuss this matter in the Council. We have particularly been appalled by the vicious cycle of attacks and reprisals, which have often resulted in the deaths of numerous innocent civilians. We are gravely concerned by the recent, unlawful seizure of power. The use of force and violence by any party in order to advance political objectives cannot be allowed to continue.

In order to mitigate the plight of refugees from Burundi and Rwanda seeking refuge in such countries as Zaire, Japan extended humanitarian assistance totalling some $54 million in the course of its previous fiscal year. This was implemented mainly through United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations. We contributed a further $10 million this year to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) to protect and assist these refugees.

As the recent report of the Secretary-General indicates, the conflict in Burundi is not susceptible to a military solution. It is imperative that all the parties refrain from the use of force and resume dialogue and negotiations in order to seek an early political settlement. Only such efforts can put an end to the turmoil in Burundi and bring stability and development to the country. We commend the efforts of former President Julius K. Nyerere of Tanzania to facilitate negotiations between the Burundi political parties, as well as the initiatives of the Organization of African Unity, as an important African effort to resolve an African conflict. We urge the parties concerned to resume negotiations through the Mwanza peace process as soon as possible.

While urging the Burundi parties to negotiate, we must also give them an incentive to do so. The international community should thus make it clear to them that a comprehensive political settlement will open the way for cooperation on the reconstruction and development of their country. Japan accordingly supports the idea of holding an international conference at an appropriate time and in a suitable format, following such a settlement.

In this connection, I might mention that the Japanese Government will host a symposium next month in Tokyo

on a related set of issues: the problems which African countries have faced in the wake of political settlements of perennial conflicts, how a truly durable peace can be achieved, and how to promote reconstruction and development despite the difficulties they face. Participants will include senior United Nations staff members, Permanent Representatives of various African countries and other authorities on these questions.

We have also noted with alarm the Secretary-General's warning that if the worst-case scenario becomes a reality there could be a genocide in Burundi, and his appeal for concerned countries to undertake contingency planning. While Japan is not in a position to provide personnel or logistical support for a multinational force, it will consider the possibility and modalities of a financial contribution, based on the plan's details as they become more clear.

I wish to conclude my statement by appealing to all the Burundi parties to commit themselves to dialogue in order to achieve a comprehensive political settlement and create the necessary conditions for national reconciliation.

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Ethiopia, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mohammed (Ethiopia) took a seat at the Council table.

The President: I call on the representative of Ethiopia.

Mr. Mohammed (Ethiopia): The situation in Burundi has continued to deteriorate, reaching its present extremely alarming and worrisome stage. Today more than ever it has become a matter of serious concern to the international community in general and to Africa in particular. The efforts made at the international, regional and subregional levels to assist the parties to the conflict in Burundi in finding a political solution to the problem in their country have not produced the desired result.

The Organization of African Unity (OAU) has been working actively to assist the people of Burundi in regaining peace and security. The diplomatic efforts by the Organization of African Unity and the presence of its military observer mission in Burundi have demonstrated Africa's concern at the escalation and turn of events in that country in the past three years.

The laudable peace initiative and the mediation launched by the former President of the United Republic of Tanzania, Mwalimu Julius Nyerere, followed and enforced by the Arusha regional summit of 25 June 1996, had given rise to new hope and optimism in the search for a political settlement of the crisis in Burundi.

The Heads of State and Government of the Great Lakes subregion, including Ethiopia, at their summit held in Arusha on 25 June 1996, reiterated the responsibility of the leadership of Burundi to restore peace and harmony to the Burundi people, and accepted the request by the constitutional Government of Burundi for security assistance aimed at guaranteeing peace and security for all the people of Burundi in their quest for a peaceful political settlement of the crisis in their country. The summit established a technical committee to look into the modalities of extending such security assistance to Burundi, and expressed its profound appreciation and support to the mediation efforts of former President Mwalimu Julius Nyerere.

Regrettably, the hope and optimism created by the Arusha regional peace initiative and by the efforts of Mr. Nyerere were slowed as a result of the military takeover in Burundi. The military *coup d'état* not only posed a serious challenge to constitutional order and legality in Burundi, but also threatens the peace and security of the country as a whole.

The international community rose in unison in condemning unequivocally the military takeover and in demanding the prompt and unconditional return of Burundi to its constitutional Government, including the restoration of its elected National Assembly.

The second Arusha regional summit, held on 31 July 1996, recognized, among other things, that the immediate problem with the current political situation in Burundi is that of illegality, which could lead to the cessation of the peace process and deepen the conflict in the country. In this connection, the summit called upon the military regime to undertake measures aimed at returning to constitutional order, the immediate

restoration of the National Assembly and the immediate unbanning of political parties in Burundi. To ensure the implementation of these immediate demands, the regional summit decided to exert maximum pressure on the military government, including through the imposition of economic sanctions. The summit also called upon the international community to support the efforts made and measures taken by the countries of region.

The initiatives of the OAU and the Arusha group are aimed at creating an environment conducive to negotiation and peaceful political dialogue among all political forces and parties in Burundi. There is no question or ambiguity as to the ultimate responsibility of the political leaders and people of Burundi to find a lasting solution to the problem in their country. It should be pointed out, however, that the military *coup d'état* of 25 July has made the problem ever more complex, raising serious doubts about the possibility, under such circumstances, of a democratic and all-inclusive political negotiation and dialogue in that troubled region of ours. Therefore, the return of Burundi to constitutional order remains a high priority and an essential prerequisite for confidence-building and mutual trust between all parties to the conflict. We call once again upon the military government to take immediate action to restore constitutional order and legality in Burundi. We also call upon all the parties to the conflict to desist from any further acts of violence and to assume the responsibility for returning their country to normalcy and peace through a negotiated political settlement.

The immediate resumption of an all-inclusive and unconditional negotiation and a political dialogue between the parties to the conflict in Burundi, in the framework of the Mwanza peace process, is indispensable. The international community should take practical measures to assist in creating the necessary conditions for such a political dialogue and negotiation. In this respect, we should stress that much remains to be done. We share the feeling and frustration of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, as stated in his report to the Security Council, that the response of Member States to the situation in Burundi has not matched the urgency and seriousness of the situation in that country. We are also of the view that efforts at the international and regional levels should be coordinated and strengthened to achieve the desired common objective of assisting the people of Burundi. In particular, we wish to stress the importance of closer cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the OAU as well as with the countries of the region.

Finally, I wish to assure the Council that the Organization of African Unity and the participants in the Arusha initiative, including my own country, Ethiopia, are committed to continuing their efforts to help the people of Burundi restore peace and security in their country.

Mr. Nkgowe (Botswana): The recent military usurpation of power from the democratically elected Government in Burundi completed what the Burundi Army had intended to do as far back as 1993. Several reasons, some contradictory, others self-serving, have been advanced to justify this coup. I believe that it is not difficult to find reasons to defend one's actions, however illegitimate or illegal. But that is beside the point. What is at issue, and a matter of profound regret, is that today some of the elected representatives of the people of Burundi, including President Ntibantunganya, have had to seek refuge in the embassies of Western democracies because of the undemocratic action of the Burundi Army. It was equally regrettable that the coup was not greeted with outright condemnation by all Members of the United Nations as a reprehensible overthrow of legitimate authority, as some delegations, including my own, would have preferred. A *coup d'état* is an illegal assumption of state power, and political illegality must not be tolerated, irrespective of the credentials of the leader of the military regime.

The *coup d'état* in Burundi, a country whose people have experienced indescribable bloodbaths and untold suffering in its recent history, especially shattered the hope of the international community, which had been pinned on the success of the Mwanza peace process and the Arusha initiative. History will record that Mr. Buyoya and company not only ousted the Government of Burundi; they have also derailed a promising peace process. The coup ridiculed all the efforts aimed at bringing about a comprehensive political dialogue. It defied the decision of the assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), which met in Yaoundé in July and, among other things, endorsed the Mwanza peace process and the Arusha initiative.

The message from Africa regarding the Burundi coup has been loud and clear: the military regime should not be allowed time to consolidate power and give itself an undue mandate to rule Burundi against the wishes of the majority of its people. The neighbouring States have spoken with one voice and have acted in a cohesive fashion. The OAU Central Organ of the Mechanism for

Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution, meeting in Addis Ababa on 5 August 1996, issued a communiqué supporting the conclusions of the second Arusha regional summit. Botswana strongly supports the neighbouring States in their determination to bring about a comprehensive political settlement in Burundi. We are therefore gratified by the decision of the European Union to also lend its support to the efforts of the regional leaders and the OAU. It is our hope that a similar message of support will emerge from this debate.

This is not the first time that African States have reacted this way to a *coup d'état*. It is not as if the coup leaders in Burundi were being singled out for punishment because they happen to be Burundians. In 1994 an attempt was made to unseat the Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho, which had assumed office after internationally observed multi-party elections. Southern African States made it abundantly clear to the coup leaders that their actions were unacceptable and the *status quo ante* was restored. This is therefore the second time in the history of coups in Africa that a group of African States has drawn a line in the sand and told the coup leaders that political illegality is unacceptable. This time the regional leaders have decided to back up their words by boycotting the military regime in Bujumbura. The actions of the neighbouring States deserve the commendation of the international community. The time of coups and army rule in Africa must be relegated to the junk heap of history, and military leaders must not be encouraged to assume power illegally because they are considered benevolent or moderate democrats. They have ample time to practise those attributes in the barracks.

We have already stated that there can be no justification for the overthrow of a legitimate Government. We have also indicated that anyone can find plausible reasons to explain or defend their actions. The military regime in Burundi has made strenuous efforts to justify the coup on the grounds of possible genocide. The legitimate Government was ostensibly overthrown in order to restore peace and security in the country and organize a national debate. There is no denying the horrendous and merciless killings and massacres in Bururi, Gitega, Muramvya and Bugendana. These were despicable acts of human barbarity. They are as unacceptable and unjustified as the coup, but they did not trigger the coup. If the killings prompted this coup, what prompted the coup attempt which led to the assassination of President Ndadaye? Why did the coup leaders not wait for the outcome of the Mwanza peace process and the Arusha initiative, which were clearly addressing the same issues of peace and security and national dialogue.

The answers to these questions cannot be found among the reasons for the coup which have been advanced by the regime. The real answers lie in the composition and structure of the Burundi Army. The Burundi Army appears to become paranoid and fearful of any leader who proposes any changes to its composition and structure. Unfortunately, this culture of fear which pervades the army is tearing asunder the whole Burundi body politic. The people of Burundi are engaged in a brutal tug-of-war in which one section of society lives in perpetual fear of extermination and the other section is in eternal fear of subjection. And the Burundi Army does not seem to enjoy the trust and confidence of all sections of Burundian society.

In these circumstances, it is clear that left alone the people of Burundi are unlikely to find a lasting solution to their problems. It is for this reason that we had hoped the Mwanza peace process and the Arusha initiative would be given a chance to come up with an amicably acceptable solution which could lead to the fulfilment of the aspirations of the majority, while guaranteeing the protection of the minority. The coup reversed all the gains that had been made in Mwanza and Arusha. It is in this context that the anger and frustration of the regional leaders must be understood.

The Burundi Army must also understand, and should be under no illusion to the contrary, that it cannot for ever enjoy the monopoly of the use of fire power. A day may come when the opposing forces which are mushrooming all over the place may become strong enough to challenge the Army, and the consequences of such an eventuality on the ordinary men and women on the street are too ghastly to contemplate. Peace and security for one and all in Burundi lie in political dialogue and not in the balance of military power.

Burundi has already produced approximately 200,000 refugees; 120,000 are in Zaire; 94,000 are in the United Republic of Tanzania. The large number of refugees imposes economic and environmental pressures on the host countries. The actions of the military leaders postponed the day when these people could return to their communes and brought to the fore the real possibility of an increase in the number of refugees. It is in view of this possibility that the countries of the region want an early solution to the Burundi crisis, as any further exacerbation of the present situation would have

far-reaching consequences on the peace, stability and development of the Great Lakes region.

My delegation is fully aware of and sensitive to the humanitarian needs of the people of Burundi. We strongly support the efforts which have been made by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in consultation with the neighbouring States and the Secretary-General of the OAU, to open humanitarian corridors. We encourage them to continue their efforts in this direction so that humanitarian goods can continue to reach all the people in Burundi.

The focus of this debate, however, should not be on the effects of the boycott of Burundi by its neighbours. The Security Council and the international community should focus attention on the objective of the boycott instead. The boycott, like sanctions, is intended to modify the behaviour of those who have usurped state power in Burundi. It is clear that the neighbouring States have made a painful but deliberate decision. The boycott is a double-edged sword. It hurts the interests of those for whom it is intended as much as those of the States imposing it. The boycott, however, seemed to be the only option open to the regional leaders.

The Security Council has been seized of the situation in Burundi for a considerable period of time now. It has adopted several resolutions and presidential statements, stating clearly what should be done to resolve the political stalemate in that country. The Council has encouraged all of Burundi's political parties to engage in dialogue aimed at establishing a permanent political settlement. It has supported the efforts of Mwalimu Julius Nyerere and has encouraged him to continue to assist the Burundians to find common ground. The regime in Burundi removed the Government from power at a time when these efforts were nearing fruition.

There can be no doubt, therefore, that the time has come for the Council to act decisively. What should come out of this meeting must be a clear statement of principle which should include the following elements: first, strong support for the neighbouring States in their efforts to find a lasting and peaceful solution which can guarantee security and democracy for all the people of Burundi; secondly, the demand that all Burundi's political parties and factions abandon violence and engage in a comprehensive dialogue under the auspices of the Mwanza peace process, being facilitated by Mwalimu Julius Nyerere, within 60 days; thirdly, imposing an arms embargo on all Burundi's factions, including those outside the country; and, lastly, declaring its readiness to impose further measures specifically targeted at those leaders who obstruct the peace process.

Mr. Somavía (Chile) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: Chile has felt particularly concerned over the tragedy the people of Burundi are experiencing. During recent months we have repeatedly emphasized the need for the Council to move towards more resolute action in order to save lives in Burundi and to help all the parties find peace and reconciliation. This feeling has intensified since the *coup d'état* of 25 July 1996, which put an end to the constitutional order and overthrew the legitimate Government of Burundi.

We are deeply troubled by the silent genocide that for years has been developing in Burundi, and we want to help put an end to it and stabilize the political situation through Security Council action.

We are concerned that the international community does not yet consider it timely to affirm that a genocide of major proportions is taking place in Burundi and to act accordingly. What can be considered genocide? Is it when 15,000 persons die, or 30,000, or 60,000 or 120,000? How much longer must we wait? Over 150,000 persons have already died in Burundi: in other words, approximately 3 per cent of the total population of that country. If we were to make a proportional calculation, this would represent about 1.5 million persons in France or in the United Kingdom, 7.5 million persons in the United States or 450,000 persons in Chile. This is the magnitude of what has already happened in Burundi, and we do not yet consider it appropriate to call it genocide.

One of the most tragic signs of these killings is that the military are killing primarily civilians of the opposite side. Both the regular Army and the armed bands are killing primarily civilians; they are not fighting each other. Every weapon that reaches Burundi is intended primarily to kill an unarmed civilian. This is why we believe it is necessary to establish a truly effective arms embargo, applicable to all the factions in Burundi. We see this much more as a way of saving human lives than as a political measure.

We are not passing moral judgement in referring to the genocide and the killing of civilians in Burundi. In this respect, no one — and I really wish to stress, no one — can cast the first stone. Unfortunately, throughout history, in all parts of the world, without exception, there have been atrocities, barbarities, acts of genocide and

crimes against humanity. We are therefore not moved to action by a moral judgement, but rather by a profound humanitarian sensibility. We believe, in spite of all historic precedents, that the atrocities of the past in various regions cannot justify the atrocities of the present.

We are discussing this issue today in the Security Council because the situation in Burundi affects international peace and security. It is necessary to develop progressively certain shared rules and standards that represent the collective feeling of a universal conscience, one that rejects and repudiates certain aberrant acts. It is essential that violations of international law not continue to go unpunished.

Problems such as the one that we are dealing with in Burundi cannot, however, be resolved in the long run only from a humanitarian perspective, although this does make it possible for us better to understand such situations. We also need capability, resolve and, above all, political will. Unfortunately, this political conviction on the need to act with determination on behalf of the people of Burundi has not been fully present thus far in the Security Council. We hope that this attitude will soon change.

In the light of the *coup d'état* in Burundi and of the actions adopted by the African countries at Arusha on 31 July, the Security Council is faced with the need to act decisively to turn events in the right direction. The indecisiveness of the past year, as we see it, cannot go on. It is obvious that this is a very complex and difficult situation for which there are no obvious solutions. Nevertheless, it is clear that inaction is becoming the worst possible course of action.

Governments and international public opinion expect the Security Council to take a clear position and to exercise its authority under the Charter of the United Nations to help alleviate the suffering of the people of Burundi, to put the country back on the path of democracy and to contribute to the stability of the Great Lakes region. The Security Council must meet this challenge.

Towards that end, a great lesson in political determination has been given us by the African leaders of the Great Lakes region. They have displayed their capacity for immediate action and a commitment to democracy which contrasted strangely with the vacillations of those who have rightly preached the benefits of democratic systems.

The underlying foundations of Chile's position in this matter are the following. First, we condemn the *coup d'état* and all those who incite violence and genocide, regardless of the source: factions, groups or parties. The violence in Burundi is not going to resolve that country's political problems.

We give our fullest support to the African regional leaders, to the Organization of African Unity and especially to former President Julius Nyerere and his commendable efforts to reach a peaceful political settlement in Burundi. We support in particular the Arusha decisions of 31 July.

We consider it urgent that political negotiations without conditions begin and that all political parties and factions, including civil society, participate in the quest for a comprehensive and sustainable political agreement.

It is also necessary that the parties — beginning with the military regime in Bujumbura — begin to display their good faith. This can be accomplished through a unilateral cessation of hostilities and through guarantees for the protection of international humanitarian personnel and the officials of the former constitutional Government. We must help put an end to the spiral of violence and impunity in Burundi.

Although we are aware of the serious consequences that certain sanctions adopted in the region may have on the population of Burundi, we feel that it is essential to establish humanitarian corridors that ensure free access to humanitarian assistance for the entire population of Burundi, and that the Secretary-General report to us on the humanitarian implications of the sanctions.

The Security Council must call for an immediate initiation of negotiations whose objective would be a comprehensive political agreement. Once that is done, the next step is to call for effective international cooperation for Burundi.

From the reports of the Secretary-General and from what we have been told by Burundians themselves, that African country has many needs to meet, and the international community must seek a way to cooperate towards that end in order to support a political agreement. Together with the economic problems, there are important structural reforms pending, such as those in the judicial, educational and public institutions.

Furthermore, if in due course all the parties in Burundi, following political agreement, so agree and so request, it might be possible to approve a conventional peace-keeping operation that would contribute to consolidating a cessation of hostilities, help maintain stability during the negotiation process and, later, provide guarantees to all parties during the implementation of a comprehensive political agreement.

The message that must come out of the Security Council is that there are many ways through which the international community can support the spirit of cooperation and understanding between the parties in Burundi. The Security Council wants there to be agreement between the parties in Burundi. Once such agreement exists, we will be willing, and the international community must be willing, to lend support in all areas — economic, political, judicial and others — in order that Burundi may once again be able to stand on its own two feet and face its future with dignity.

If the parties do not begin negotiations within 60 days, which is a reasonable period of time, then the Security Council must be prepared to consider measures, under the United Nations Charter, aimed at those leaders who continue to promote violence and who obstruct peace agreements. It must be understood, once and for all, that when the agreements are not implemented, those who are mainly responsible are the leaders who are not leading their peoples towards the necessary agreements.

I want to conclude by saying that the military *coup d'état* introduces a new situation, and there are three reasons why we must act decisively, now.

The first is that although it was impossible to put it into practice, there was before the *coup d'état* a governmental understanding that was derailed by the military coup. In addition to that, former President Nyerere was making mediation efforts, which obviously suffered setbacks with this serious event.

Secondly, the regional community in Africa has reacted, as we know. Chile favours regional solutions and listens principally to what regional leaders think on African topics. Furthermore, it is a historical fact that there has again been a strong condemnation of a military coup in Africa by African leaders themselves, and this is something that cannot be overlooked. We cannot and must not send a signal that is at odds with the line of action being imposed in Africa.

Thirdly, this is an opportune moment. The *coup d'état* in Burundi is a negative milestone, but it cannot be disregarded; it is a fact. This is the time for the international community — through the Security Council in this case, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) at the regional level, and all Governments concerned that are taking steps to help Burundi make real progress — to act with resolve and with the same objectives. I believe that the main task that lies ahead for all of us is to see to it that the international community speaks in unison and that it promote solutions tending in the same direction, so that Burundi will receive a single message from outside with regard to the positive aspects and the risks involved if a positive agreement is not achieved.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that we give our most whole-hearted support to former President Nyerere for the tasks that lie ahead. He is the person who has the political weight, the moral stature and the regional and international respectability needed to achieve a comprehensive political settlement in Burundi. Whatever the Security Council does must be in support of his endeavours.

We also want to thank the European Union for its latest statements of support for the African initiatives, and in particular we thank Mr. Aldo Ajello for his tireless efforts for peace in Burundi.

Our appreciation also goes to Mr. Howard Wolpe, who, on behalf of the United States, is trying to contribute to a meeting in the country at an early date. We also thank the Government of Belgium for its traditional presence in the region.

We give our support as well to the Secretary-General and to Mr. Faguy for their efforts. There are many people of good will and many countries trying to contribute on the ground to the achievement of a return to democratic processes.

In Burundi there are many who are responsible: the leaders of the various parties and factions, military officials, those who have access to lesser or greater shares of power. Among them, Mr. Buyoya and those who control the military regime have a special responsibility, stemming from the fact that they decided to carry out the *coup d'état* on 25 July. Having decided to take that measure, they have the primary responsibility to see to it that the country progresses towards peace.

All of them must bear one thing in mind: whatever action the Security Council takes in representation of the international community — action that we hope will be reflected in the nearest possible future — has as its sole objective to create an opportunity for the children, the parents and the families of Burundi to grow, live and, above all, to coexist, in a climate of peace, security and development. Those children, and history, will pass judgement on the parents who held political or military responsibility in the Burundi of today. At present the international community is holding a hand out to Burundi, offering cooperation and understanding if Burundians reach agreement; but at the same time it is telling them that if they do not do so, it will not leave Burundi all alone.

Mr. Ladsous (France) (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council has on several occasions set out the principles that would make it possible to bring about a political settlement in Burundi. To summarize these principles, it is a matter, first and foremost, of the cessation of violence, the initiation of a comprehensive political dialogue between all the parties, without exception, and finally, support for those initiatives from outside that are designed to facilitate such a dialogue.

The Council reacted to the events of 25 July of this year in the presidential statement of 29 July, in which it condemned the actions leading to the overthrow of constitutional order in Burundi. It once more requested the cessation of violence and the commencement of a dialogue that would lead to a political settlement of the crisis on the basis of institutional consensus.

The demands expressed by the Council a month ago call for a reply on the part of all the parties and leaders of Burundi. The French delegation will associate itself with the efforts of the Council to ensure that this response is a positive one and that it comes quickly.

The French delegation, in the spirit of the statement made by the European Union on 19 August, which was quoted earlier by the representative of Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Union, supports the efforts made by the regional leaders, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and former President Nyerere to help Burundi overcome the very serious crisis it is experiencing. Like its European partners, France is concerned by the humanitarian repercussions of the measures taken by the States in the region, particularly by the impact of these measures on disadvantaged groups. It is important that international organizations and non-governmental organizations be able to continue their work on behalf of these groups. My delegation considers that this question should be examined as a question of urgency and with the greatest possible attention.

Furthermore, the French delegation would still like a conference to be held, as soon as conditions are met, on the situation in the Great Lakes region, under the aegis of the United Nations and with the support of the Organization of African Unity.

Mr. Wisnumurti (Indonesia): Let me begin by expressing the Indonesian delegation's appreciation to you, Mr. President, for convening this formal meeting to address the situation in Burundi, an issue of urgent importance to the international community. We welcome this open debate, as it provides the opportunity for Member States to express their views, which will constitute valuable input for the Council.

The international community is faced with a serious challenge to legitimacy and rule of law as a result of the *coup d'état* in Burundi, which has halted all efforts to find a peaceful solution to the conflict, to avert the recurrence of genocide and to promote national reconciliation, especially those undertaken by the neighbouring States and spearheaded by former President Nyerere. I would like to reiterate Indonesia's position that a peaceful solution to the conflict in Burundi can be attained only through negotiations and dialogue between all parties. In view of the dangerous potential for this conflict to spill over to the neighbouring countries, threatening peace and stability in the region, my delegation believes that any further procrastination and ambivalence on the part of the Security Council will not only have severe consequences for Burundi, but will also encourage the spread of instability in the Great Lakes region. It is in this context that we welcome the regional and international peace initiatives, particularly the efforts of former President Nyerere, which we fully support.

The conundrum that Burundians must face in order to end any further ethnic massacres and to begin comprehensive negotiations is reflected in the views of Mr. Nyerere that to be successful, talks must find solutions for two problems: first, that the Hutu have been politically disenfranchised since independence 35 years ago and, secondly, that many Tutsi genuinely fear they will be massacred if the Hutu come to power. Hence, the conflict in Burundi stems from the deeply rooted perception that the survival of each community will be imperilled unless it secures the reins of power for itself. In this regard, we share the Secretary-General's view that

the forceful overthrow of the legal Government in Burundi, which was elected to change the status quo through democratic means, will not solve the problems of the country. It symbolizes the continued control of one ethnic group over the reins of power. Military means have only provoked further violence as the country has fallen into a cycle of violence which seems to perpetuate itself. Clearly, the coup of 25 July 1996 has only complicated the already dangerous situation by reinforcing the fears on one side and strengthening extremists on both sides. The only viable solution can be found in the establishment of a political mechanism for power-sharing between the majority and the minority.

To reach this goal, the international community should send a strong message to the leaders who are now in control in Bujumbura and take the necessary measures to ensure that, first, they undertake immediate and unconditional negotiations with all parties inside and outside the country; secondly, that they return to constitutional order and legality; thirdly, that they restore the National Assembly; and, fourthly, that they unban all political parties and assure the protection of their members. It is therefore imperative for the international community to assist in the effective organization of all-inclusive negotiations towards reaching a political settlement. It is our considered opinion that once negotiations have been undertaken in earnest, this would provide renewed impetus for the resolution of all aspects of this conflict. The desire of Burundians to break with the political traditions of the past and begin a dialogue conducive to national reconciliation has to be respected. Failure to do so will only permit the present situation of prevailing insecurity and impunity for violent acts to continue.

In this context, we commend the swift and unified response of the countries of the region against those who are now in power in Burundi. The regional leadership has indeed taken measures to pressure Burundi to restore respect for constitutional legitimacy and resume the process of finding a comprehensive political settlement through dialogue and negotiations. It is essential for the international community to lend its support to those regional initiatives. Failure to do so will send the wrong signal to Bujumbura.

The international community has a definite role to play in alleviating the risk of a humanitarian catastrophe in Burundi. Given this context, my delegation fully supports the establishment of humanitarian corridors which will not only alleviate the economic difficulties due to the sanctions, but may also reduce the risk of further escalation of tensions due to the shortage of basic humanitarian needs. We would also like to place our support behind the development of contingency planning for a rapid humanitarian response in the event of widespread violence or a serious deterioration of the situation in Burundi.

Another role the Security Council can play is in promoting transparency and informing the international community of events in Burundi, both past and present. In this regard, we are pleased to note the publication of the results of the International Commission of Inquiry that investigated the assassination in 1993 of Burundi's first elected President and the massacres that followed, in which both Tutsi and Hutu were killed. We would like to recall that all persons who committed or authorized the commission of serious violations of international humanitarian law are individually responsible for such violations and should be held accountable. Those responsible for crimes against humanity and, in this case, their fellow countrymen should be brought to justice. The United Nations can also contribute to the edification of an impartial and independent judicial system, as this would solve and correct one of the fundamental inequalities and causes of conflict in Burundi.

Mr. Fulci (Italy): First of all, let me voice the full support of Italy, as a member of the European Union, for the statement that the representative of Ireland made this morning on behalf of the European Union.

We appreciate the fact that the request by the Permanent Representative of Burundi, Ambassador Nsanze, to hold today's debate was promptly granted by the Council. As the Council knows, my delegation lent its convinced support to this request, considering it an important question of principle. We strongly believe that every Member State of the United Nations — every one, seated or not seated on the Security Council — has the right to express in full and make known its country's position on questions which it deems of vital interest to it.

The international community is following the developments in Burundi with growing apprehension. Diplomatic activity is intense, involving the direct commitment of special envoys and prominent figures from the African countries — in the first place, former President Julius Nyerere of Tanzania, from the Organization of African Unity, from the United States and, of course, from the European Union. Now, more than ever, we need the close cooperation of everybody

who is directly or indirectly concerned in this question. It is encouraging that the main facilitators of this process are united in their assessments and objectives. Even as I speak, President Julius Nyerere is in Rome, where he will receive an award for his relentless quest for peace.

Yesterday we learned in the news that before leaving for Rome, former President Nyerere met with Major Buyoya in Dar es Salaam. We feel that the very fact that the meeting took place, and that it took place in Dar es Salaam, is a step in the right direction: the direction of an immediate national dialogue open to all the components of Burundi society, including all civil organizations, and aimed at ending the violence and at fully re-establishing parliamentary democracy in the country.

Recent indications on the situation in Burundi, particularly the Secretary-General's report, stress the extreme fragility of the internal situation in Burundi. Intense fighting and attacks on the civilian population throughout the country have made the humanitarian situation highly precarious. For the moment, we cannot even discard the hypothesis that the worst will happen and that a new genocide — because one has already been committed, as we understood from our friend Ambassador Somavía — might break out in Burundi. This is why the Secretary-General has asked Member States to prepare contingency plans for a peace-keeping operation to save the civilian population from fatal massacre.

It is an absolute priority, therefore, that an immediate cease-fire be reached to fend off the threat of more death, more violence and more destruction. A climate of greater mutual confidence must be established. Suspicions and distrust create, in and of themselves, fractures and greater tensions. If political dialogue can begin, a serious political dialogue of course, then Burundi can lay the basis for fully reconstructing its democratic institutions and re-entering the road towards economic development, without which, in the end, there can be no lasting peace.

Italy is aware of the close ties between the various political, economic and humanitarian problems that characterize the region and of the continued risks of destabilization. In the search for a lasting solution to the crisis, we again underline the need for an approach that is global and has a regional dimension. The presence of more than 1.5 million refugees in the region represents a highly destabilizing factor. Their return to their countries of origin in conditions of security and dignity is essential to the restoration of peace.

Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali, President Nyerere, the Special Envoy of the European Union for the Great Lakes region, Mr. Ajello, and the American Envoy, Mr. Wolpe, are united in affirming that the international community's support is essential to relaunching the democratic process in Burundi. If the Security Council wishes to activate a credible process of national reconciliation, it must express itself clearly on the objectives to be pursued.

That is why we are grateful to the Permanent Representative of Chile, Ambassador Somavía, for having presented during informal consultations a draft resolution that is meant to send a precise political signal and a concrete response to the great difficulties that Burundi is experiencing. It is extremely important, in our view, that a resolution on such a delicate and complex matter be the fruit of a full consensus within the Security Council. Two principles should guide the action of the Council. First, it should move in such a way as to encourage the parties to proceed in good faith and with good will to the negotiating table, avoiding confrontation. This must not be a question of the imposition of the will of one over the will of the other. The most important thing is that dialogue and close cooperation prevail. And, secondly, it should alleviate the great suffering of the innocent civilian population, beginning with the refugees.

In the past two years Italy has reserved for Burundi an important share of its bilateral and multilateral aid to the region. It is the Italian Government's intention to relaunch to the greatest extent possible its humanitarian activities there and to consider new initiatives aimed at revamping our action towards African countries, with which we have long been so closely linked by historical, economic, cultural and, above all, human ties.

Mr. Park (Republic of Korea): For the last few years, the situation in Burundi has remained a priority on the agenda of this Council. Despite the continued attention and efforts of the international community, however, there have been no signs of alleviation in the plight of the Burundian people. Rather to our despair, the events of one month ago testify to the fact that Burundi is not a land that allows the slightest room for wishful thinking.

The latest report of the Secretary-General, of 15 August 1996, gives a detailed account of the political plunge of the Burundian parties, which saw its nadir in the 25 July coup, as well as a vivid description of the precarious security and humanitarian situation,

characterized by mass killings that have terrorized large segments of the population. As indicated by the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights, the generalized lack of safety, the climate of fear, hatred and exclusion and the prevalent culture of impunity are poisoning human relations and paralysing all initiatives to lift the country out of chaos. In particular, we note with grave concern the Secretary-General's observation that the unfortunate event of 25 July will reinforce the fears of one ethnic group and strengthen extremists on both sides, thus increasing violence and adding to the suffering of the Burundian people.

My delegation believes that the current situation in Burundi underscores the fact that the international community should, with the utmost urgency, make every effort to prevent any further deterioration of the situation and put Burundi back on the track of dialogue for peace and a political settlement. We fully share the Secretary-General's observation that the conflict in Burundi is not susceptible to a military solution and that political mechanisms to share power have to be found with the help of outsiders. In this regard, my delegation cannot fail to express its disappointment at the inability of the Burundian parties to seize the opportunity that was created by the Mwanza and Arusha I processes, driven in particular by the relentless efforts of former President Nyerere.

In this context, I should like to stress the critical importance of the decisions of the Arusha II summit. Among other things, we highly value the resolve of the countries in the region to react in a unified, resolute and prompt manner. We fully support the measures taken at the summit to bring to bear upon the Burundian parties an optimal level of pressure so that serious negotiations for a political settlement can be reopened in Burundi. This initiative is a manifestation of the division of labour between the United Nations and the regional communities, and complements the fulfilment of the purpose of the United Nations. It also marks a historic milestone in the furtherance of the region's commitment to democracy by pronouncing itself, in the most unequivocal terms, against the overthrow of a legitimate Government. I am certain that this initiative is bound to have a long-lasting, salutary effect on the democratic future of the African continent. Now that the regional community has come up with its own action, the Security Council has to resume its primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and stability in the Great Lakes region.

Now I should like to suggest two overriding guidelines for contemplating the Council's future course of action. First of all, we should bear in mind the importance of taking seriously into account the gravity and volatility of the situation in Burundi. Our action should be oriented towards minimizing the risk of triggering a chain reaction that could inadvertently turn the situation into a major crisis. Secondly, we cannot afford to wait too long, as this would send the wrong signal to the Burundian parties. We find it imperative to make these parties refrain from violence and commit themselves to a negotiated resolution of the conflict. All our efforts should be directed towards encouraging them to resume, without delay, a process of political dialogue that will bring together all political forces in Burundi without exception and without any preconditions.

In this regard, we strongly support the efforts that former President Nyerere, the regional leaders and other international mediators are making to help facilitate this process. To achieve this objective, we ought to consider every option at our disposal. Truly it is not an easy thing to strike a proper balance between the need for action and the risk of action. But it is not an impossible task, either.

On the other hand, there is an equally pressing need for contingency planning on a much bigger scale and of a wider scope, as is well elaborated in the Secretary-General's report. It is unfortunate to find that this contingency planning has yet to be fully developed due to the insufficient level of Members' commitments. My delegation is of the view that we should facilitate, with a sense of urgency, contingency planning as an essential part of our action plan. My delegation wishes to convey its appreciation to the Secretariat for the laudable efforts it has made thus far, despite many constraints, towards this cause.

Before concluding, my delegation wishes to express its belief that today's debate on Burundi is very timely and appropriate. The time is ripe for us to take an initiative for the effective management of the crisis situation in Burundi. Today's debate will give us precious input from many interested countries, which will be used for fine-tuning our deliberations. It is my delegation's hope that this debate will lead us to a package of actions that will best serve the interests of the Burundian people and the international community.

Mr. Matuszewski (Poland): Since the Polish delegation associated itself with the statement made on behalf of the European Union by the representative of

Ireland, I would only like to briefly comment on the issues which are of particular importance to my delegation.

Like other members of the international community, we too are gravely concerned about the situation in Burundi. The future of that country is at stake, as is the peace and security of the region as a whole. This is a real emergency. The time has come for the Burundi leaders to find their way to peace, democracy and security. We urge them to start immediately meaningful political dialogue. It has to address the very roots of the conflict, which, as the Secretary-General rightly observed in his report, is not susceptible to a military solution. All political forces in Burundi and all segments of the society have to be given a seat at the negotiating table.

May I confirm the support of the Polish delegation for the regional leaders, the Organization of African Unity (OAU), and former President Julius Nyerere, who have already displayed patience and skill in their efforts to facilitate the search for a political solution in Burundi. My delegation also wishes to declare its support for the work of the United States special envoy and that of the special representative of the European Union. We hope that the parties in Burundi will be willing to profit from that form of international assistance.

We urge the leaders in Burundi to declare an immediate cease-fire and to put an end to the continuing violence in the country. Let me express, as we have on many previous occasions, our deep sympathy and compassion for the people of Burundi, who are paying dearly for their leaders having been, so far, unable to speak one to another. The humanitarian situation in Burundi continues to cause us considerable concern. The parties to the conflict should be aware of their responsibility for the peoples' lives and well-being.

This is an important debate. We are convinced that the views expressed in this Chamber will guide us in our search for the best response to the situation in Burundi.

Mr. Inderfurth (United States of America): On 29 July the Council called on the military leaders in Bujumbura,

> "to restore constitutional government and processes, including the continuation of the elected National Assembly and civil institutions and respect for human rights." *(S/PRST/1996/32, second paragraph)*

Regrettably, there has been no progress towards these objectives. The leaders of the 25 July military *coup d'état* in Bujumbura have taken no apparent steps to restore democracy, and the indiscriminate killings on both sides have continued.

The most recent report of the Secretary-General points alarmingly to the further worsening of the situation in Burundi and to the failure of both the civilian and military leaders either to resolve their differences or to heed clear warnings given by the Secretary-General, the Security Council and numerous world leaders.

The United States applauds the efforts of the States of the region to bring pressure to bear on the coup leaders. We will seek above all to support the objectives of Arusha in calling on the new regime to undertake immediate and unconditional negotiations with all parties inside and outside the country, to return to constitutional order and legality, to restore the National Assembly, and to unban all political parties. We also strongly support the stated intention of these States to cooperate fully with the United Nations and work towards measures aimed at avoiding a humanitarian catastrophe in Burundi.

The Arusha States have also imposed economic sanctions on Burundi. We strongly support this step and believe it indicates the determination of the regional States to achieve the goals I mentioned earlier. We also hope these sanctions will convince the coup leaders that they have no alternative but to halt the fighting and initiate a political dialogue. If this does not work, the Security Council is willing to consider further action in support of cessation of hostilities, or to compel cessation of hostilities. Such action could include an arms embargo or targeted sanctions against faction leaders, as the situation warrants. All sanctions must be carefully implemented to permit continued humanitarian relief so that they do not injure the already suffering innocent civilians in this crisis-torn country. And, of course, we should stand ready to support any genuine opening to peace and dialogue.

Further measures both at the United Nations and in the region must be carefully calibrated to events in Burundi. The fate of Burundi is today, more than ever, in the hands of the Burundians. We are sending a very strong message to both the present regime and insurgents inside and outside Burundi that the international community will not tolerate genocide and the threat this poses to peace and security of the Great Lakes region as

a whole. All parties must commit themselves to a cessation of hostilities and a dialogue aimed at establishing a lasting cease-fire, an end to killing and a comprehensive political settlement.

The Secretary-General's report correctly observes that the conflict in Burundi is not susceptible to a military solution. The factions in Burundi must overcome their deep-seated distrust and fears in order to identify and establish an effective political mechanism for themselves.

The United States commends with great appreciation the efforts of the Secretary-General and his staff; the work of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Faguy; the Organization of African Unity and its Secretary-General, Salim Salim; former President Nyerere of Tanzania; the regional leaders from Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zaire, who met in Arusha on 31 July; and other representatives of the international community who have, worked tirelessly to avert a further worsening of the situation in Burundi.

The Secretary-General's report notes that the Secretariat has continued to facilitate contingency planning for a rapid humanitarian response to a crisis in Burundi. While we will continue to attach our highest priority to promoting a peaceful solution based on political dialogue, my Government welcomes finalization of the Emergency Operations Plan for Burundi, which ensures that United Nations agencies can function together to provide the maximum level of emergency assistance in the event of a serious escalation of the conflict. The United States has worked closely with the United Nations Secretariat in its two-track approach to military contingency planning and continues to urge that other Governments support this effort. The international community must always allow for the possibility that the worst may happen in Burundi. The international community must avoid a replay of the horrors that befell Rwanda. The international community must do all it can to be ready to act if the need arises.

The Security Council must therefore take further action. To that end, we will be working with other members of the Council this week to produce a resolution that sends an unmistakable and frank message to leaders of the Burundian factions: stop the killing now and initiate an immediate dialogue. Without timely progress towards these goals, it will be difficult to act to avoid a humanitarian crisis. But with progress can come a return of international support.

Mr. Lopes Cabral (Guinea-Bissau) *(interpretation from French)*: The recent history of Burundi has unfortunately accustomed us to troubles and ethnic and political upheavals of all kinds. The domination and pre-eminence of an ethnic group that is a one numerical minority, the rebellion of the majority, the fierce struggle for political power, conflicts, confrontations, massacres, vendettas and what have you, have, unfortunately, for more than 30 years, set the stage for one of the most lethal tragedies ever known by Africa. The most recent report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Burundi attests to this disastrous state of affairs and, unfortunately, supports this overall view.

Today, according to the prevailing moods and preferences of the time, Burundi may either claim our attention, baffle our wits, question our conscience or quite simply be shunted aside along with other matters, because some find it banal.

The people of Burundi deserve to have the Security Council turn its attention to their future, because indeed no predetermined fate should prevent them from fully and freely enjoying their future, let alone stand in the way of their progress towards national unity and peace.

The military *coup d'etat* of 25 July last in Burundi was a violent act that flew in the face of established constitutional order, accelerated the spiral of violence and arbitrarily usurped political power to the detriment of democracy, national reconciliation and peace in that country. There can be no doubt that this is an illegal act that tends to confirm the primacy of arms over ballots. It must be rejected and, above all, unambiguously condemned.

The people of Burundi, at the same time incredulous witnesses and innocent victims of the extremism practised by both camps, find themselves trapped in a hellish cycle of violence. The balance that was so difficult to establish has been disturbed, and violence fuelled by a hatred repressed for generations, is now breaking out, unrestrained and unappeased.

The conflict in Burundi is exacerbated by the deeply held conviction of both communities that their survival is compromised if they do not hold the reins of power. Quite clearly, this conflict does not lend itself to a ready-made solution or, even less so, to one that is imposed from outside. We have to find the sort of political machinery that can promote a sharing of power between the two ethnic groups, the Hutu and the Tutsi. We have

to appease the anxieties of one and promote the trust of the other.

The abrupt breach of the Convention on Governance of 1994, which was the only legal framework that most of the actors on the Burundian political scene could trust enough to associate themselves with, could once again trigger a resurgence of violence and could increase and prolong the suffering of the people of Burundi.

The Security Council cannot condone the use of force in resolving the situation in Burundi. The Burundian Army and its leaders must respect constitutional legality and the institutions that derive from it. The guns must fall silent and give way to dialogue.

Indeed, we believe that national reconciliation is the only way of establishing and consolidating a lasting peace in Burundi. Guinea-Bissau appeals urgently to our brothers and sisters in Burundi to finally set aside their political affiliations, their ethnicity and their ideological leanings and honestly, courageously and promptly enter into an open and constructive dialogue in order to create a climate of trust, recognition and mutual respect conducive to peace and security for all throughout the national territory.

What do the people of Burundi expect of us? What can we undertake together, here and now, which might help return Burundian troops to their barracks and usher in pluralistic democracy in Burundi? How can we promote the restoration of constitutional legality in the wake of the *coup d'etat* of 25 July last? What means do we have available to us to induce, by which I mean oblige, the current military junta to respect the rules of the democratic game? What, finally, is the purpose and the scope of the sanctions that have been imposed on Burundi by its neighbours?

The resumption of dialogue and negotiations, in the framework of the Mwanza talks held under the auspices of former President Julius Nyerere, should be encouraged. It also seems to us that the sanctions imposed by Burundi's neighbours in a selective, targeted and time-limited way against those responsible for the *coup d'etat* and their supporters may speed up this process. This will happen provided that these sanctions are supported in principle by the rest of the international community, and provided that they are accompanied by measures that are capable of limiting their cost to society. Any individual or collective action on the part of our States must follow that logic and should be conducive to restoring genuine legality and peace in Burundi.

In the opinion of my delegation, humanitarian action should continue. Likewise, it is essential to study, starting now, all the necessary modalities for resuming development aid once peace, national reconciliation, democracy and strict respect for human rights have become established and have finally triumphed, both in the thinking and in the conduct of all the citizens of Burundi, who will finally be brought together and will coalesce into a single, unified nation.

Mr. Martínez Blanco (Honduras) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Honduras views with extreme concern the continuing deterioration of the security and humanitarian situation in Burundi, exacerbated by the *coup d'etat* of last 25 July, and by the threat that the persistence of this situation represents to the peace and security of the Great Lakes region.

The delegation of Honduras considers that the ethnic violence, the suffering of the population of Burundi and the exodus of refugees will persist, affecting the stability of the region at large, until constitutional order is restored and the necessary political dialogue begins between the parties to allow for a broad settlement of the situation.

My delegation therefore makes an urgent appeal to the Burundian parties to make every necessary effort to generate mutual trust and to create the conditions for peace and national reconciliation. We urge them to find without delay the appropriate political mechanisms to make it possible to find a satisfactory solution to the crisis, with the understanding that only a broad and permanent political settlement providing for how the Government will be shared between the Hutu majority and the Tutsi minority can constitute the key element for establishing peace and harmony between Burundians, putting Burundi back on the path towards democracy and making possible international cooperation for reconstruction, development and the stability of the country. It is only through dialogue that the democratic and institutional consensus will be achieved to help bring peace, security and tranquillity to the population of Burundi.

We understand that in the present circumstances the promotion of a broad-based political dialogue in Burundi is a difficult task. For this reason, the support that this Council can give to the resumption of dialogue and negotiations under the auspices of the Mwanza peace process is important, as is the support that it can give to the efforts made by former President Nyerere to facilitate

a lasting political solution to the crisis. We also consider essential the support that this Council can give to the regional efforts made and initiatives taken to help find a peaceful solution to the situation in Burundi, in particular the decisions taken at the second Arusha summit.

My delegation is aware that the present situation in Burundi represents a threat to the peace and security of the Great Lakes region. There is still the possibility of an escalation of the violence in Burundi which could attain a regional scope. For this reason we recognize the importance of the different regional and international initiatives, in particular those of the Organization of African Unity and the efforts of former President Nyerere to find a peaceful solution to the crisis in Burundi.

In connection with the humanitarian situation, we believe that until an end is put to the ethnic violence, to the climate of impunity and to the violations of human rights, genocide will remain a possibility in Burundi. For this reason we are of the opinion that, at the same time as efforts are being made toward the establishment of dialogue among the Burundian parties, contingency planning must continue for a rapid humanitarian response in the event the violence should become widespread or the situation in the country worsen.

My delegation understands that it is up to the Burundians themselves to shape their own destiny and to overcome the obstacles to the attainment of peace and national reconciliation. The most important thing right now is the prompt return to constitutional order and the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. We reiterate our appeal to organize a dialogue without delay, a dialogue that by bringing together all the political forces of Burundi can allow for a democratic and institutional consensus, which is the only realistic way to find a permanent solution to the crisis.

Mr. Abdel Aziz (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Egypt has followed with deep interest and concern the developments in Burundi since the events of last 25 July, as well as the response of the neighbouring African States. We have followed them not only in view of their potential repercussions on the stability of this important subregion of the African continent, but also because of the movement of the Burundi armed forces to take political power and the installation of a new President which, in effect, pre-empts the arrangements reached at the first Arusha summit. Under those arrangements, a multinational African force would have been dispatched to enforce security and stability in Burundi, a notion that was initially put forward by the Government of Burundi and was later endorsed by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in Yaoundé.

Developments in Burundi — the most serious of which are ethnic killings and massacres as related by Amnesty International, which documented the killing of over 4,000 unarmed civilians in Gitega Province — prove that there is indeed no alternative to a political formula for power-sharing to safeguard the rights of both the majority and the minority communities, while taking into account the lessons learned from the shortcomings of the Convention on Governance of 1994.

It has become abundantly clear that the parties to the conflict in Burundi are incapable of reaching an agreement among themselves and that they are indeed in need of help from outside. Hence, Egypt subscribes to the efforts undertaken by the neighbouring States to achieve a peaceful settlement to the crisis. In point of fact, those States have a better sense of the root causes and dimensions of the problems. After all, it is those neighbouring States that would eventually bear the spillover consequences and risks of a festering crisis. Furthermore, such endeavours supplement the mediation efforts pursued by former President Nyerere and other mediators.

In the same vein, Egypt subscribes to the efforts made and positions adopted by the OAU, which deployed an observer Mission in Burundi over three years ago and was the first body to address the crisis there.

Egypt maintains that several measures should be immediately taken to restore constitutional legality and order in Burundi. These include the unbanning of all political parties, the restoration of the National Assembly, the initiation of businesslike and unconditional negotiations between all political and military powers in the context of the mediation efforts pursued by former President Nyerere, guarantees for the security and safety of members of the former Government, the immediate cessation of all acts of violence, ensuring the delivery of humanitarian assistance to the targeted needy groups throughout Burundi and ensuring the safety and security of personnel of regional and international humanitarian agencies.

Egypt agrees that it is wrong to rule out the possibility of the perpetration of further ethnic massacres. Hence, we maintain that it is essential to continue contingency planning for a rapid humanitarian response, in the event the international community has to intervene

to save innocent lives. In this context, we feel that differences over the definition of the entity to be entrusted with the contingency planning have sent the wrong signals, in view of the seriousness of such endeavours. This must be avoided in the future when addressing such complex crises.

We sincerely hope that all parties to the conflict in Burundi will overcome the psychological barrier that prevents them from recognizing the impossibility of imposing a situation that is unjust to some parties. The citizens of Burundi must be able to put aside the tragic events of both the distant past and the present, and to embark on building mutual trust in place of distrust and fear. We hope that the current Government will recognize the expectations of the international community in this regard. In this context, we hope that the recent meeting between Major Buyoya and former President Nyerere proves to be a step in the right direction.

Egypt maintains that the problems of the Great Lakes subregion of Africa do not lend themselves to viable solutions unless the regional dimensions of such problems are taken fully into account. We hope that the international community, the neighbouring African States and international mediators will pursue their efforts to lay the ground for convening a regional conference on security and development in this region. Proper timing and good preparatory work for such a conference are crucial factors for an effective outcome. Obviously, the success of this conference will largely depend on the genuine desire of the participants to reach a lasting political solution to the problems in Burundi.

Finally, the delegation of Egypt would like to take this opportunity to put on record its appreciation for the efforts of the Secretary-General and his aides, particularly his Special Representative for Burundi.

Mr. Gomersall (United Kingdom): This is not the first debate we have held in this Chamber on Burundi. What is new since the last occasion is the coup against the constitutional Government in the country and, more hopefully, the strength of the region's response to that situation and determination to restore political and constitutional order. What has not changed, as the Secretary-General's report makes clear, is the appalling violence which continues to be inflicted on the people of Burundi by other Burundians.

We agree with the Secretary-General's conclusion that the conflict in Burundi is not susceptible to a military solution, and that the international community must continue to focus its efforts on bringing the parties together to end the fighting, to restore a legitimate government and to achieve lasting national reconciliation in Burundi.

My Government welcomes and fully supports the initiatives taken at Arusha by the leaders of the States neighbouring Burundi, and the mediation efforts of former President Nyerere in particular. We welcome the principled approach of the region towards the unconstitutional change of government which took place in Burundi on 25 July, and we share their determination to press for the return of constitutional order and a negotiated settlement to end this long-standing conflict. We welcome the African lead, while believing that the Security Council and the international community also have a vital role to play.

The Council now has before it a draft resolution which should, in our view, be an important vehicle for coordinating the response of the region with that of the wider international community. We support the decisions taken at Arusha with regard to economic sanctions, but we share the Secretary-General's concern about the possible effect of sanctions on humanitarian supplies and personnel. Humanitarian agencies must be allowed unrestricted access to those in need and must be able to operate in conditions of adequate security. We welcome, therefore, the decision of the regional leaders to establish a regional coordinating committee in Nairobi, and the assurance that humanitarian supplies will be allowed access. We call on the parties in Burundi to cease attacks on aid workers and to ensure that they can operate in secure conditions.

We also see a continuing need for the presence of human rights observers in Burundi. We commend the team there now, both on what it has achieved so far and on the courage which they have displayed in difficult circumstances.

Major Buyoya has made many public promises since 25 July. He has also taken some actions with regard to control of the armed forces which are potentially positive. At the same time, it is clear that acts of oppression continue and that there is no national consensus as yet behind his proposal for an extended transitional period before a return to constitutional government. He must respond to the concerns expressed by the regional community. We welcome the fact that he has publicly stated his willingness to enter into dialogue

and that he has met with former President Nyerere. We call similarly on other parties to the conflict to commit themselves to early all-party talks.

All parties must agree now to an immediate cease-fire and enter into serious negotiations. If a cease-fire is declared, we are willing to provide practical assistance to the regional efforts to assure adequate security for all in Burundi. And, once a lasting settlement has been achieved, we are willing to contribute to international efforts to restore Burundi's economy in support of such a settlement.

While it is right to focus on achieving a settlement, we also agree with the Secretary-General that contingency planning should continue in case regional and international efforts are not sufficient to forestall a humanitarian catastrophe in Burundi.

Finally, the responsibility for ending the killing lies with the leaders of Burundi and the factions outside it. They must act now so that a process of genuine political dialogue can begin. We encourage those who currently hold power in the country to act for their country by seeking agreement with other groups and seizing the opportunity which has been presented by the Arusha process to begin the hard, but in the long run, inescapable task of rebuilding a single nation under a constitution which enjoys the widest possible support.

Mr. He Yafei (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): We welcome the open debate today in the Security Council on the situation in Burundi and believe that this will help the international community reach a common understanding on a proper settlement of the question of Burundi.

We are of the view that the key to settling the Burundian question lies in national reconciliation, peaceful coexistence and power-sharing by the two ethnic groups in Burundi, while the only way to achieve this objective is for all parties in Burundi to cease all hostilities immediately and to enter into dialogue and negotiations unconditionally, with a view to seeking a political solution for lasting peace, stability and security in the country. We believe that the international community should also take this into consideration in its efforts to settle the question of Burundi. The pressing task for the Council now on this question is to make all Burundian parties clearly understand this situation, renounce the use of force and devote themselves to genuine peaceful negotiations.

We share the Secretary-General's view that the Burundian question is not susceptible to a military solution and that a political solution should be found instead. There are complicated historical and present-day factors underlying the Burundian question. It is therefore by no means easy to settle it once and for all. However, we believe that this question must and can be thoroughly resolved, which will not only benefit the Burundian people, but also contribute to peace and stability in the region. The Burundian people, who have already suffered enormously from chaos and conflicts, aspire to stability. We are of the view that a final settlement of the Burundian question lies with the Burundian people themselves. We strongly urge the leaders of all Burundian parties to proceed from the aspirations of their people and their national interests; to renounce violence and pursue dialogue; to forsake ethnic hatred and strive for national reconciliation; and to halt interfactional fighting and work for their national interests. We will, as always, support all measures that will contribute to peace and stability in Burundi.

We wish to express our understanding of the efforts that have for some time been made by African countries, particularly the neighbouring countries of Burundi, for the settlement of the Burundian question. In this connection, we particularly appreciate the untiring efforts made by former President Nyerere of Tanzania in mediating the crisis in Burundi. The Chinese Government provided assistance, within its capacity, to President Nyerere in his activities to resolve the Burundian question, and we will continue to give our support in all areas in the future. We hope that the Burundian parties will cooperate closely with President Nyerere so as to bring their country back onto the path of peace, democracy, unity and recovery at an early date.

The Chinese Government has all along shown great interest in the destiny of the African people. We deeply sympathize with the Burundian people in their sufferings, caused by protracted fighting and poverty. We hope that these sufferings will soon be a thing of the past and that the Burundian people will live a happy and tranquil life at the earliest possible date. We will work together with the international community to this end.

Mr. Fedotov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Russian Federation has had more than one occasion to express its deep concern at the tragic events in Burundi. The acute political crisis that has been going on there for more than three years now, accompanied by bloody inter-ethnic clashes, has already cost the lives of tens of thousands of people and has unleashed a wave of refugees and displaced persons. A

large-scale humanitarian crisis is taking shape there, which threatens to destabilize this already troubled part of Africa. Throughout the entire Burundian crisis, the Security Council has been paying very close attention to exploring ways and means of handling it. We hope that today's official meeting will provide a further incentive for efforts to be mobilized in that direction. The Russian delegation is firmly convinced that the problems of Burundi cannot be resolved by military means or by coups. We believe it is important to ensure the restoration in this country of constitutional forms of governance, both for reasons of principle and in order to provide the necessary conditions to revive an inter-Burundian dialogue. We believe that clear priority should be given to political methods.

The main things now are to prevent the worst of all possible developments — the outbreak of bloody violence — to force the leaders in Burundi to sit at the negotiating table, to ensure a lasting cease-fire and to promptly organize talks without any preconditions between the representatives of all political forces without exception.

The task of the international community and the mediators in which they have placed their trust is to promote carefully gauged and well-balanced decisions, which, on the one hand, would remove the threat of another wave of bloodshed and genocide and, on the other hand, would set the parties to the conflict in Burundi on the road to creating political machinery that would provide the appropriate security guarantees for all Burundians. Otherwise, we believe it would be impossible to really normalize the situation and to establish lasting peace and agreement.

In this connection, we have always welcomed and supported the efforts of the countries in the subregion, which have proved to be a key factor in the settlement. They have demonstrated the growing resolve of the African States to make sincere efforts to calm dangerous hotbeds of civil war and inter-ethnic conflict in their own backyard. We also have great respect for their decision, reached by consensus, to exert pressure on Burundi, including through the imposition of sanctions.

We also value deeply the aspiration of countries neighbouring Burundi to take into account the obvious consequences of these steps for ordinary Burundians and to keep open the possibility of humanitarian efforts by international organizations, because, after all, this is a matter of principle. We need to ensure the proper observance of humanitarian standards for sanctions in order to minimize their detrimental effect on the already grievous situation of the broad segments of the Burundian population that have been worn down by a protracted and bloody conflict.

Sanctions should have very clear-cut criteria and time-frames for their introduction and lifting, and they should be aimed first and foremost at extremist forces both within the country and beyond its borders — those forces that oppose the cessation of violence and are hindering a serious negotiating process. These pressures can yield the desired political effect, provided that they are quite clearly selective in nature and that they are utilized flexibly and adapted to Burundi's domestic political dynamics, including the specific acts of each of the parties.

Here we believe that the most effective steps would be the imposition of an arms embargo on all Burundian opposition parties, the freezing of their assets in foreign banks and the introduction of other possible restrictions affecting the personal interests of the extremist leaders, until they put an end to the violence and conclude a lasting peace agreement.

It is very important that pressure tactics be backed by a clear signal to all extremist forces indicating that if acts of violence become widespread and if a large-scale humanitarian catastrophe is looming, the international community will be obliged to react accordingly. We believe that the United Nations Secretariat should intensify its efforts to provide advance planning for such humanitarian action, taking into account all possible scenarios.

We are convinced also that sending a Security Council mission to Burundi at the appropriate time could prove extremely useful to thoroughly assess the situation and to influence the parties to the conflict by stimulating them to make progress in the peace process.

Russia, as a permanent member of the Security Council, is aware of its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Therefore, in concert with other members of the Security Council, it will duly participate in efforts made by the international community to normalize the situation and to prevent the spread of violence in Burundi, as well as to ensure the strict observance of generally accepted norms of human rights and humanitarian law.

The President: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of Germany.

At the outset, I wish to point out that Germany fully supports the statement made by the representative of Ireland on behalf of the European Union.

The situation in Burundi remains a matter of deep concern to us. We remain, in particular, deeply disturbed by reports of massacres of civilians, which seem to continue unabated in Burundi. The violence in Burundi must stop. We are also concerned with regard to the implications of the internal crisis in Burundi for peace and security in the already troubled Great Lakes region.

The Secretary-General stresses in his recent report that the conflict in Burundi is not susceptible to a military solution. We share this view. We have taken note with interest of recent indications that political and faction leaders in Burundi might have expressed themselves accordingly.

Germany considers it essential that a dialogue be organized without delay that would bring together all of Burundi's political forces without exception, including representatives of civil society, in order to find a negotiated consensus solution to the crisis in Burundi, ensuring security for all.

In this context, we wish to express our support for the efforts of the regional leaders, and in particular for those of former President Julius Nyerere, to facilitate the search for a political solution to the crisis in Burundi. We specifically support their call on the Bujumbura regime to immediately restore the National Assembly, lift the ban on political parties and undertake negotiations with all the parties to the conflict.

We also wish to take this opportunity to reiterate the importance we attach to the prompt and satisfactory resolution of the situation of those who have sought protection in our and other foreign missions in Bujumbura.

The sanctions imposed by the regional leaders should not, as the Secretary-General rightly mentioned, be seen as an instrument of punishment. They are a means to an end. On the other hand, they should not be allowed to add to the hardship of the suffering people in Burundi. We therefore welcome the efforts to formulate specific exemptions to the sanctions regime for humanitarian purposes.

We welcome the recent publication of the final report of the International Commission of Inquiry concerning the assassination of the President of Burundi on 21 October 1993 and the massacres that followed. We hope that this can be a contribution to overcoming the present state of impunity in Burundi, which has been described in the latest report of the Secretary-General as poisoning human relations and paralysing all initiatives to lift the country out of chaos. I also wish to reiterate the importance we attach to the renewed deployment throughout the country, as soon as possible, of human rights observers, which have so far been funded by the European Commission.

Germany has in the past significantly contributed, at both the bilateral and multilateral levels, to the improvement of the humanitarian situation in Burundi and that of the Burundian refugees in the Great Lakes region. It stands ready to support further Burundi's recovery efforts, once the necessary national reconciliation is embarked upon.

The Security Council is currently seized of the situation in Burundi. The German delegation will continue to contribute constructively to the drafting of a Security Council resolution on Burundi. It is our hope that the discussion on the imposition of further measures by the Security Council will become obsolete as we see progress in the development of the situation on the ground.

I now resume my function as President of the Council.

I understand that the representative of Burundi has asked to speak, and I now call on him.

Mr. Nsanze (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): I am fully aware that the hour is late, and consequently my statement will be brief. I simply wish to assure the Security Council that the Burundi regime is fully prepared to enter into a dialogue with all those groups and factions that are claiming any rights whatsoever. The Security Council should thus take account of this solemn pledge by the new regime.

Secondly, it should be pointed out that the report of the Secretary-General, which on the whole does reflect the unfortunate reality, tends to concentrate on the situation that prevailed before 25 July last. This report would have been much more useful if it had been updated so as to include mention of the massacres.

Today, the situation is far from being as alarming as it was presented and described by a fair number of speakers.

In this regard, on Friday, 23 August, the Government published a statement in which it invites the entire international community, starting with Amnesty International, to immediately begin investigations of this monstrous allegation by the representative of Amnesty International in Burundi. Today I received a copy of a message sent by the Government of Burundi to the Secretary-General and to the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, inviting them to increase the number of human rights observers, since the current Government,

> "in the face of the lethal acts of violence of all kinds which have been perpetrated for three years against the innocent civilian population",

is firmly resolved to take all appropriate preventive and repressive measures to end the cycle of violence as soon as possible. Indeed, it intends to ensure lasting respect for human rights, integrity and the safety of all human beings in Burundi. I wish to communicate this to the Council now, before officially passing the document to you, Mr. President, or to your successor, the Ambassador of Guinea-Bissau.

Regarding the mission entrusted to former President Nyerere, eminent colleagues are often concerned with defending certain ideas. However, we had also stressed from the outset, before any external political intervention, that the new regime urged President Nyerere to reactivate the talks and bring together all the groups and parties involved in the conflict. In this connection as well, I would like to assure the Security Council and the international community that the present regime did not succumb to begging or to force. It fully intended to follow that imperative.

Finally, we might invoke a concept of a celebrated philosopher, Hegel, who was a compatriot of yours, Mr. President. He said — and I quote this without the text, but I think I quote it correctly — that "history teaches us that man learns nothing from history". This quote is addressed to certain colleagues and certain speakers who spoke somewhat critically, possibly in a way rather disproportionate to the real state of affairs and without, perhaps, taking into account the history of their own countries. But as we have had occasion to point it out, Burundi will certainly be able to resume the true and authentic democratic process.

The President: There are no further speakers.

The next meeting of the Security Council to continue the consideration of the item on the agenda will be fixed in consultation with the members of the Council.

The meeting rose at 2.15 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.3693

Security Council

Fifty-first Year

Provisional

3693rd Meeting

Friday, 30 August 1996, 11.50 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Eitel	(Germany)
Members:	Botswana	Mr. Nkgowe
	Chile	Mr. Searle
	China	Mr. Qin Huasun
	Egypt	Mr. Abdel Aziz
	France	Mr. Ladsous
	Guinea-Bissau	Mr. Lopes Cabral
	Honduras	Mr. Martínez Blanco
	Indonesia	Mr. Wisnumurti
	Italy	Mr. Fulci
	Poland	Mr. Matuszewski
	Republic of Korea	Mr. Park
	Russian Federation	Mr. Fedotov
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Richmond
	United States of America	Mr. Inderfurth

Agenda

Demining in the context of United Nations peace-keeping

96-86138 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 11.50 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Demining in the context of United Nations peace-keeping

The President: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Following consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council has reviewed the issue of demining in the context of United Nations peace-keeping and has given careful consideration to the views expressed in the open debate under the item 'Demining in the context of United Nations peace-keeping' in its 3689th meeting on 15 August 1996.

"The Security Council, bearing in mind its responsibilities with regard to United Nations peace-keeping, notes that the widespread indiscriminate use of anti-personnel mines in areas of United Nations peace-keeping operations poses serious impediments to such operations and to the safety of United Nations and other international personnel. Against this background, the Council states the following:

"1. Operational demining should be, wherever appropriate, an important element and an integral part of peace-keeping mandates. This will facilitate the implementation of those mandates and better enable the Secretary-General to allocate appropriate resources towards achieving their objectives.

"2. The early deployment of mine-clearance units will often be important to the effectiveness of a peace-keeping operation. The Council encourages the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations to examine options for achieving such early deployment. It also encourages Member States to examine whether and in what form they might be able to help in this respect.

"3. The tasks of, on the one hand, operational mine clearance during peace-keeping operations, which is the responsibility of the Department of Peace-keeping Operations, and, on the other hand, longer-term humanitarian mine-clearance activities, which fall under the responsibility of the Department of Humanitarian Affairs, are different. The Council is, however, aware of linkages and complementarities between different elements of conflict resolution as well as of the need to ensure a smooth transition from demining as a peace-keeping requirement to demining as part of peace-building in a follow-up phase.

"The Security Council, thus, is of the opinion that coordination and a clear delineation of responsibilities between the two Departments as well as with regard to other United Nations agencies dealing with demining could be further improved so as to avoid duplication of effort and to guarantee a coherent and integrated approach towards the whole range of short and long-term demining needs. With particular reference to paragraph 51 of the report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations of 7 May 1996 (A/51/130), the Council requests the Secretary-General to intensify his efforts aiming in this direction.

"The Security Council emphasizes the importance of coordination by the United Nations of activities related to mine clearance in the context of United Nations peace-keeping, including those by Regional Organizations, in particular in the areas of information and training.

"4. The primary responsibility for demining in the context of United Nations peace-keeping lies with parties responsible for the laying of mines. Parties to a conflict must desist from further mine laying once a peace-keeping operation is established. They are also obliged to facilitate humanitarian and military demining efforts by providing detailed maps and other relevant information on those mines that have already been laid by them and by contributing financially or otherwise to their removal.

"5. The international community should intensify, multilaterally or bilaterally, its efforts in assisting those parties to a conflict which have shown their readiness to cooperate with mine clearance, mine awareness and training programmes in the context of United Nations peace-keeping operations. In this connection, the Council welcomes the establishment by the Secretary-

General of a United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund for Demining as a necessary and timely mechanism to channel funding to humanitarian demining operations.

"The Security Council appeals to all States to contribute to this Fund as well as to other voluntary funds set up by the Secretary-General for certain peace-keeping operations which contain demining elements.

"6. Demining activities should, as much as possible, make use of the appropriate modern mine-clearance technologies and specialized equipment and focus on the creation and strengthening of local demining capabilities; training programmes should attach particular importance to this aspect. Where this would be of benefit to the operational effectiveness of a peace-keeping operation, consideration should also be given to including provision for the training of a local demining capability in mandates of peace-keeping operations.

"The Security Council encourages the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, given its responsibility for a comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations, to continue and intensify its considerations of the operational demining aspects of peace-keeping operations. These considerations might include an analysis of mine-clearance experience in previous peace-keeping operations.

"The Security Council is of the view that the elements outlined in this statement are not exhaustive. The Council will thus keep this issue under review in the context of the establishment of peace-keeping operations and the consideration of specific mandates."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/1996/37.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.

United Nations S/PV.3694

Security Council

Fifty-first Year

Provisional

3694th Meeting

Friday, 30 August 1996, 12 noon

New York

President:	Mr. Eitel	(Germany)
Members:	Botswana	Mr. Nkgowe
	Chile	Mr. Searle
	China	Mr. Qin Huasun
	Egypt	Mr. Abdel Aziz
	France	Mr. Ladsous
	Guinea-Bissau	Mr. Lopes Cabral
	Honduras	Mr. Martínez Blanco
	Indonesia	Mr. Wisnumurti
	Italy	Mr. Fulci
	Poland	Mr. Matuszewski
	Republic of Korea	Mr. Park
	Russian Federation	Mr. Fedotov
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Gomersall
	United States of America	Mr. Inderfurth

Agenda

The situation in Liberia

Eighteenth progress report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (S/1996/684)

96-86144 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 12 noon.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Liberia

Eighteenth progress report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (S/1996/684)

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representatives of Liberia and Nigeria, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bull (Liberia) took a seat at the Council table; Mr. Ayewah (Nigeria) took the seat reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the eighteenth progress report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia, document S/1996/684.

Members of the Council also have before them document S/1996/701, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to document S/1996/679, which contains the text of a letter dated 21 August 1996 from the Chargé d'affaires *ad interim* of the Permanent Mission of Nigeria to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council, transmitting, on behalf of the Head of State of the Federal Republic of Nigeria and Chairman of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the final communiqué of the Heads of State and Government of the Economic Community of West African States Committee of Nine on Liberia, issued at its fourth meeting, held at Abuja on 17 August 1996.

The first speaker on my list is the representative of Liberia, on whom I now call.

Mr. Bull (Liberia): As you end your presidency of the Council for this month, Sir, I should like, on behalf of the delegation of Liberia, to warmly congratulate you on having so skilfully carried out the responsibilities entrusted to you. We particularly applaud your recent initiative in convening a formal meeting to discuss the issue of demining in the context of United Nations peace-keeping. This matter is of vital importance to the reconstruction efforts of countries which have been ravaged by war, such as Liberia.

My delegation also extends its appreciation to your distinguished predecessor, the Ambassador of France, for the able manner in which he guided the Council's work last month.

The Council will shortly take action on the Secretary-General's recommendations outlined in his eighteenth progress report on the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia, contained in document S/1996/684 of 22 August 1996. Permit me to thank the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, for the report and for his continued commitment to the quest for lasting peace in Liberia.

The outbreak of hostilities in Liberia last April was a serious setback to the peace process. Today, the renewed hope in the continuing progress and viability of the Abuja Accord is due to the commendable efforts of the leaders of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and other national, regional and international actors who worked tirelessly over the past four months to prevent the country's slide into a state of anarchy.

Since the signing of the revised Abuja Agreement, which incorporates far-reaching decisions, including a new timetable for encampment, disarmament and reintegration of combatants and the holding of democratic elections by 30 May 1997, the leaders of the warring factions have pledged anew their commitment to the implementation of the revised Agreement.

To be sure, the repeated failure of the warring factions to honour more than 12 previous agreements has raised reasonable doubts about their sincerity and commitment to these new undertakings. Nevertheless, the delegation of Liberia believes that several recent developments have increased the prospects for a peaceful transition in Liberia. First, the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) adopted a resolution during their annual meeting, held in Yaounde, on 8-10 July 1996, which threatened the faction leaders with punitive measures, including the imposition of sanctions against them and the possibility of establishing a war crimes tribunal for Liberia. This OAU resolve was reinforced at the subregional level by the Heads of State and Government of the Economic Community of West African States during their Summits held in Abuja on 26-27 July 1996 and 17 August 1996.

Secondly, the resumption of armed hostilities in April and the inability of any warring faction to overwhelm another, even with the non-intervention of the ECOWAS Cease-fire Monitoring Group (ECOMOG), has clearly demonstrated that there cannot be any victor in the war.

Thirdly, the ECOWAS member States have taken concerted action on several important issues: the Abuja Agreement has been extended until 15 June 1997 and a new timetable formulated for its implementation; other member States in the subregion — Mali, Gambia, Burkina Faso and Côte d'Ivoire — have decided to deploy troops or personnel to Liberia. Moreover, there is a new resolve by the ECOWAS countries, under the leadership of its current Chairman, President Sani Abacha of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, to remain fully engaged in the resolution of the Liberian conflict.

Fourthly, the re-emergence of civil society in the peace process reflects the determination of the civilian majority to actively participate in decisions affecting them. It was civilian groups which advocated a change in the chairmanship of the Council of State, leading to the selection of Mrs. Ruth Perry, former Senator of Grand Cape Mount county and the first female to assume the highest post in government since the country's independence 149 years ago. She is expected to be formally inaugurated in Monrovia on Tuesday, 3 September 1996.

These developments make us confident that if internal and external pressures are maintained on the present leadership, the faction leaders will realize that it is in their best interest to implement, without further delay, the provisions of the Abuja Agreement. Indeed, since the signing of the Agreement on 17 August 1996, the faction leaders have publicly pledged their total commitment to peace and are taking measures, including the dismantling of checkpoints and the partial disarming of some of their forces, pursuant to the terms of the Agreement. While these are encouraging developments, nothing short of their full compliance with the terms of the Agreement will lead to durable peace.

It is well known that since the commencement of the civil crisis, the member States of ECOWAS have continued to make substantial sacrifices in pursuit of peace in Liberia. While the ECOWAS peace initiative has experienced some financial and administrative problems, it nevertheless represents a pioneering effort to bring to fruition Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations. This praiseworthy effort is deeply appreciated by the Liberian people and deserves greater support from the United Nations.

In this connection, the Liberian delegation would like to re-emphasize the urgent need for the United Nations to ensure that there is a mechanism whereby subregional and regional peace-keeping operations undertaken with the approval of the Security Council receive the requisite support.

In order to build on the recent positive developments in the peace process, ECOMOG must be fully supported. In keeping with recent decisions, ECOMOG has to increase its troop strength to 18,000, and an estimated $132 million is required to assist ECOMOG to implement its mandate. The lack of support from the international community following the signing of the Abuja Agreement in August 1995 prevented ECOMOG from deploying throughout the country as called for by the timetable formulated by the parties. The tragic developments which ensued in Liberia as a result of this deficiency are well known to the international community. It is therefore the prayerful hope of the Liberian people that these negative developments will not be allowed to reoccur because of lack of support for ECOWAS.

It is clear that there are urgent needs which must be quickly satisfied in order to advance the peace process in Liberia. Foremost among these is the need for assistance to ECOMOG to facilitate its deployment throughout the country, leading to the encampment, disarmament and demobilization of combatants and their reintegration into civil society. Concomitantly, Liberian refugees would be repatriated and resettled and pilot programmes undertaken to rehabilitate combatants. The army and paramilitary

organizations would be reorganized and preparations for elections undertaken by a reconstituted and independent Elections Commission.

As regards elections in Liberia, it is imperative that they be preceded by the complete disarmament of combatants. It is important to stress the need for the electoral process to be internationally supervised and declared to be free and fair. Due to the adverse effects which the civil war has had on all Liberians, the people will not accept any leadership which attains political power by fraudulent means. This is why the international community must help support the disarmament and electoral processes as means of ensuring permanent peace in Liberia.

The total disarmament of combatants will prevent intimidation of the electorate, build confidence and facilitate national reconciliation and reconstruction of the country. It is most unfortunate that those who have pledged to honor the terms of the Abuja Agreement which, *inter alia*, requires the disarmament of combatants, would oppose rather than support the process in its entirety, since it is widely seen as a precondition for durable peace. Would opposition to total disarmament not imply some hidden agenda? Would total disarmament not ensure that those bearing arms after the completion of the process were doing so illegally, thereby ensuring accountability and restoration of civil society and the rule of law?

It is important to emphasize that these laudable objectives cannot be achieved without the support of the international community. On behalf of the Liberian Government and people, I appeal to all Member States to contribute generously to the Trust Fund for Liberia. We thank all the countries which have made contributions to this important effort. The Liberian people, who have been deprived of their rights for so long, are depending on the Security Council to take the lead in supporting the efforts of ECOWAS to achieve peaceful change in Liberia.

As the security situation continues to improve in the country, the Liberian delegation appeals to governmental and non-governmental organizations to resume fully their activities in Liberia, activities which are so vital to the humanitarian needs of the people and the revival of development activities in the country.

We endorse the draft resolution on Liberia now before the Security Council and join in its appeal to Member States to comply fully with the arms embargo on Liberia.

The United Nations has been involved in the peace process since the commencement of the civil crisis in Liberia. In spite of the setbacks, we must not allow ourselves to be discouraged. Liberians have the faith and the determination, as recent developments confirm, that the path ahead will ultimately lead to the restoration of peace and democracy in Liberia.

The President: I thank the representative of Liberia for his kind words addressed to my predecessor and to me. I take it he was not aware of the new practice of the Council to encourage speakers to forgo the expression of compliments to the President and his predecessor.

The next speaker is the representative of Nigeria. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Ayewah (Nigeria): Almost one year ago, on 15 September 1995 to be precise, we were holding a similar meeting in this Chamber, welcoming the Abuja Agreement of 15 August 1995 on Liberia. The Council will recall that on that occasion we were generally confident and optimistic that at last Liberia was on the road to peace and security, after the nightmare of the civil war of the previous six years.

The leaders of the subregion had made an appeal to the international community to assist the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in the implementation of the Accord. They also sent a message to the factional leaders about their frustration at their lack of cooperation in implementing the Accord and the need for them to deliver on their commitments in the interest of peace. Members of the international community collectively reaffirmed on that occasion their commitment to the cause of peace in Liberia and promised not to abandon its people. A pledging conference on Liberia and the requirements of ECOMOG was subsequently held here at United Nations Headquarters.

Unfortunately, we are meeting here today in the Security Council not to welcome the installation of a new Government in Liberia, as called for in the implementation plan, but to support the extension of the implementation schedule of the Abuja Accord, by a period of almost another year.

There is enough blame to go around for the setback that we have witnessed, but the major responsibility lies with those who signed an Agreement to end the war in their country but later reneged. During the open debate

on Liberia last May, Council members and other United Nations Member States carried out a critical assessment of the state of play in Liberia and agreed to delay further action until after the meeting of ECOWAS leaders in August of this year.

Fortunately, we have achieved some positive results, which is the basis of our deliberations today. After intensive consultations with all parties concerned and painstaking preparations, the ECOWAS Committee of Nine, at its Summit Meeting in Abuja on 17 August 1996, came up with a new implementation schedule for the Abuja Agreement. While we welcome what has been achieved in Abuja, for which we commend the leadership of ECOWAS, my delegation is all too aware that only with the commitment to peace and national reconciliation of the Liberian parties, particularly the factional leaders, and with the continued support of the international community will we be able to ensure that this will be the last extension of the implementation schedule.

None the less, we believe that on the basis of past experience, the new plan, with its provision for the periodic review of progress in the implementation of the Agreement and the formulation of a code of conduct for members of the Council of State and transitional government, as well as the decision to impose sanctions against any party not in compliance with these measures, may well help to usher in peace and stability in Liberia. We, however, need to be vigilant in ensuring strict adherence by the parties to the implementation plan and schedule, and to this end, a well-equipped and highly motivated ECOMOG force is essential — even more so since in the ninth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution it is suggested that a continued presence of the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL) is predicated on the presence of ECOMOG and its commitment to ensure the safety of UNOMIL. We would in turn suggest that the Council ensure that ECOMOG is enabled to do so through assistance to it. In this regard, the recent steps taken by ECOMOG to enhance its capability need to be complemented by international assistance in the form of logistical and financial resources. Such assistance should be unfettered and given to ECOMOG directly so as not to undermine its cohesiveness as a unified peace-keeping force. We are happy to note the indications of positive response from various quarters. We hope that the pledges of support will soon materialize. Time is of the essence. As we have come to realize at great cost in human lives and material resources, any long lull between a cease-fire and demobilization of combatants risks jeopardizing the tentative gains that have been made on the path to peace.

At the same time, UNOMIL's presence needs to be beefed up significantly and in timely fashion to complement ECOMOG's deployment. We note the intention of the Secretary-General in this regard and urge him to consider further increases in line with his own assessment of the situation and on the basis of the mandate which he already possesses.

For so long we have addressed the Liberian parties and factional leaders. We have called upon them and appealed to them to try to overcome their political differences in the interest of peace and reconciliation in their country. They have so far failed to heed those calls and appeals. This is unfortunate. One positive development, however, out of the recent unfortunate fighting in Monrovia, is the increasing assertiveness and visibility of the civilian population concerning the direction of their country. We welcome this trend, and believe it can only have a salutary and positive impact on the peace process. We hope the Liberian parties and leaders will now agree to conduct themselves in the interest of peace, national reconciliation and reconstruction. The new implementation plan offers them that opportunity.

In concluding, we wish Ms. Perry well as she assumes next Tuesday the mantle of leadership of the Liberian Council of State.

With regard to the draft resolution, we agree with its general thrust and import. It is a continued commitment by the international community to the cause of peace in Liberia. Expressions of support are, however, not enough, and in this context, we note the request to the Secretary-General in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution to come up with concrete proposals to assist the process. We hope those proposals will also take into account the requirements of ECOMOG in its leading role in finding a solution to the Liberian crisis.

The President: It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall first call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

Mr. Fulci (Italy): I wish to thank the United States delegation for preparing this draft resolution, on which it was possible, with few amendments, for the members of the Security Council to reach a full consensus, thereby making it possible to transform it into a presidential draft.

Italy welcomes the results of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Summit of 17 August and the appointment of Ms. Perry as Chairperson of the Council of State of Liberia. I would be grateful to our colleague Ambassador William Bull if he would kindly convey to the new Chairperson all Italy's best wishes for a successful chairmanship with a view to the reconciliation and reconstruction of her country.

The results of the meeting of 17 August prove once again, in our opinion, the ability of the African regional organizations to play a major constructive role in crisis management. Italy fully supports the efforts of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in the framework of the ongoing attention my country dedicates to regional organizations, particularly in the African context. In this regard, I wish to express my particular appreciation for the role played by ECOWAS, through the good offices provided by our colleague and good friend Ambassador Gambari of Nigeria, to rescue some Italian families trapped in a difficult situation and bring them to the safety of the American compound in Monrovia.

We would be remiss, however, to think that the Abuja Agreement will put an end to our apprehension over Liberia. Too many times, alas, we have applauded new agreements there, only to see them violated a few days or a few weeks later. We sincerely hope that this will not happen again this time, and that the faction leaders of Liberia will finally show the political will to fully respect and implement the terms of the Agreement they have just signed. Should they not do so, the international community, as the Secretary-General rightly pointed out, will be left with no alternative but to withdraw altogether from Liberia.

The Somalia precedent should make the faction leaders aware of their responsibilities and of what to expect should they fail to honour the agreements just reached. Unfortunately, the theft of almost 900 motor vehicles belonging to the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) and to United Nations agencies is hardly a positive sign in terms of the attitude of some of the warlords towards the international community. This is why we insisted that terms be indicated for the Secretary-General to report to the Council on the effective return of the stolen property, property which belongs to the international community. Ambassador Jonah, during his briefing to the Council, mentioned that the warlords were taken aback by world reaction to their behaviour. Thus, they must become even more aware that the international community will hold them personally responsible for breaches of human rights and humanitarian law in the country.

Let me once again voice our horror at one of the most despicable actions of the Liberian warlords: their practice of recruiting, training, and deploying children for combat. Training and often drugging children, many of them aged seven to fourteen, who often end up killing relatives and terrorizing their neighbourhoods, is an unconscionable crime. Words alone do not suffice to condemn this heinous behaviour. This behaviour must be stopped immediately, by every means the international community has available, including that of writing some provision, the framework of what will soon become the international criminal court, in order to bring to justice the perpetrators of such intolerable acts.

Finally, we fully support the Secretary-General's recommendation to extend the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL) mandate to 30 November 1996. For all these reasons, and in complete agreement with the rest of its content, Italy will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. Elaraby (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The result of the latest Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Summit, held on 17 August, which concluded with the signing by faction leaders of the revised timetable to implement the Abuja Agreement on national reconciliation in Liberia, has revived hopes once again that the faction leaders will this time fulfil their commitments and rise above personal differences and narrow ambitions, and that national interests and the interests of the people of Liberia will prevail over all other considerations.

Despite some positive indicators, most importantly respect for the cease-fire and the redeployment of the ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) in Monrovia, the record of the peace process in Liberia is still replete with well-known setbacks, most seriously the interfactional combat last April. These regrettable incidents, which have frustrated the international community, prevent us from having a great deal of optimism or hope today, and from counting on the

seriousness or good intentions of the faction leaders. We were pleased that some days ago Mr. James Jonah, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General, firmed that the ECOWAS countries have taken a number of measures to ensure the good conduct of the faction leaders, including the creation of a list of sanctions that may be imposed on their factions and their families in the event they renege on their commitment to elaborate a code of conduct to govern relations between factions. We are also pleased at the election of Ms. Ruth Perry to preside over the Council of State, which will ensure its autonomy and enhance its authority.

The measures taken by the ECOWAS countries, which are in harmony with similar measures taken by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the clear position the OAU took on this subject, emphasize the extreme importance of the African regional arrangements aimed at restoring peace and stability in Liberia.

During the last six years ECOWAS countries have made efforts that deserve encouragement and support. The latest resolution to increase the strength and effectiveness of ECOMOG, despite the difficult circumstances in which these countries find themselves, furnishes ample evidence of their determination to proceed in their endeavour to establish peace in Liberia.

In this context, we must thank the countries that provided technical and financial support to ECOMOG and the United Nations Trust Fund for Liberia. We must also express the hope that ECOMOG and the Fund will receive further financial contributions to help them in future tasks.

The Egyptian delegation supports the draft resolution before the Council and will vote in favour of it. We are convinced that the Liberian people need another chance. As has been rightly said by many, this may be its last chance. We hope that future developments will reinforce the hope that elections will take place on the 30 May 1997, as decided, and that the Liberian leaders will cooperate in preparing appropriately for the elections, including by establishing an independent national committee similar to the one successfully established in Sierra Leone.

In conclusion, I would like to note that Liberia has a long way to go, even after elections. Daunting tasks lie ahead, the most important of which are the reintegration of demobilized soldiers into civilian life and the reconstruction of the country's structure and infrastructure, which have been devastated by the war. However the international community, which stood by Liberia's side in its plight and during the war, will surely lend support in time of peace until Liberia's regional and international status is restored.

Mr. Nkgowe (Botswana): The recent Summit meeting of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) was an important milestone in the search for peace in Liberia. The outcome of the meeting reflects the unity of purpose of the States of the subregion and their resolve to help Liberians find a permanent political solution to the crisis which has bedevilled their country for far too long. Botswana commends ECOWAS member States for the monumental work they have done to give Liberia yet another chance to settle its political problems, even after several such chances were in the past squandered by the faction leaders.

We particularly welcome the decision of the Heads of State of ECOWAS to impose measures on those leaders who obstruct the peace process. The active participation and contribution of the organizations of civil society at the Abuja Summit is an important development in articulating the voices of the disenfranchised people of Liberia. They represent the hopes and aspirations of the silent majority that we have been calling on the international community not to abandon, and it is time the faction leaders paid close attention to what they have to say.

The commitment and determination of the member States of ECOWAS to resolve the crisis in Liberia is beyond reproach. The revised schedule for the implementation of the Abuja peace Agreement is a demonstration of the importance ECOWAS attaches to the peace process in Liberia. Significant adjustments have been made to the mandate of the Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) to enable the subregional peace-keeping force to meet any challenges and obstacles it may encounter in the implementation of the revised schedule. Moreover, several States of the subregion have stated their readiness to contribute additional troops to strengthen the operational capability of ECOMOG. ECOWAS has thus responded constructively and creatively to the suggestions made by some members of the international community to stay the course. It is only fair that the international community should respond appropriately to the needs of ECOMOG to enable it to deploy its troops in accordance with the revised schedule.

The humanitarian situation in Liberia requires the continued attention of the international community. Humanitarian organizations have been at the forefront of the efforts to deliver much-needed assistance to the people of Liberia, sometimes at great risk to the personal safety of their personnel. The Council is therefore right to make a clear and unequivocal demand that the faction leaders strictly respect the status of personnel of the humanitarian organizations. The wanton looting of equipment belonging to United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations dealt a severe blow to the work of the humanitarian community. This is an intolerable pattern of behaviour which the Security Council cannot condone. It must stop. It is only right that the Council insist on the return of all stolen property. It is important for the faction leaders to realize that they cannot escape responsibility for the actions of the combatants they unleashed on the citizens of Liberia, on their property and on equipment belonging to the international community. We therefore look forward to the report of the Secretary-General on this matter.

Botswana fully supports the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL) for a further period of three months. The States of the subregion deserve the strong support of the United Nations. It is important that the United Nations should continue to play an active role in the resolution of the political crisis in Liberia. The United Nations has an important contribution to make in the implementation of the Abuja Agreement. The cease-fire, the disengagement and the demobilization of the combatants, the return and resettlement of refugees and displaced persons and the electoral process are the major phases of the Abuja peace Agreement which need the support and close involvement of the United Nations system. The United Nations will also help bludgeon the Liberian faction leaders to implement in full and on time the commitments and obligations they undertook under the Abuja peace Agreement. The faction leaders must not be allowed to hold the whole nation hostage to their desire to rule at all costs. The Liberian faction leaders must not be allowed to frustrate the efforts of the international community to resolve the political crisis in Liberia. They must not be allowed to realize their objective of forcing the United Nations out of Liberia. It must be made clear to them that they will be held personally accountable for violations of international humanitarian law and human rights.

In conclusion, I wish to congratulate Ms. Ruth Perry on her assumption of the chairmanship of the Council of State. Ms. Perry assumes the onerous tasks of guiding government business at a crucial moment in the history of the Liberian peace process. She has the full support and best wishes of Botswana as she nurtures the very delicate process of turning despair into hope.

Mr. Qin Huasun (China) *(interpretation from Chinese)*: The Chinese delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution before us. We are in favour of the Secretary-General's recommendation to extend the mandate of the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL) by another three months, in support of the peace process in Liberia and the unremitting efforts of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) to resolve the Liberian conflict.

We appreciate the contributions made at the ECOWAS Summit of 17 August to restoring the Liberian peace process. Over the years ECOWAS has made unremitting efforts to end fighting in Liberia despite its own economic difficulties. ECOWAS countries have sent peace-keeping forces to Liberia in accordance with Chapter VIII of the Charter and, braving hardships and setbacks, offered good offices and mediation to facilitate a peaceful settlement of the Liberian conflict.

China has consistently rendered firm support to regional organizations in their efforts to resolve problems in their respective regions, pursuant to the provisions of the United Nations Charter. We have noted that a new timetable and concrete measures were worked out at the recent ECOWAS Summit to ensure the implementation of the Abuja Agreement. This has demonstrated the determination, perseverance and confidence of ECOWAS. We are of the view that the international community should support the ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) in various ways for its successful fulfilment of the peace-keeping mission. We hope that ECOMOG and UNOMIL will continue to closely cooperate and coordinate with each other to ensure the effective implementation of the new timetable of the Abuja Agreement.

As is pointed out in the draft resolution before us, the final settlement of the Liberian conflict can depend only on the Liberian people themselves and on the readiness of the leaders of all Liberian parties, proceeding from the interests of their country and people, to demonstrate good faith in political reconciliation, to give up the use of force and to seek a political solution acceptable to all parties through patient and sincere negotiations and dialogue. At this critical juncture in the Liberian peace process, we sincerely hope that the parties in Liberia will seize the favourable opportunity of the

extension of UNOMIL's mandate to complete the disarmament of their forces in earnest and to make good preparations for the general elections so as to ultimately achieve national reconciliation and restore peace in the country through fair elections.

We support the international community, including the United Nations, in promoting the Liberian peace process together with ECOWAS, thus making their contributions to peace in West Africa. We have always believed that a stable and growing Africa is an important and indispensable component of a peaceful and prosperous world. We sincerely hope that Liberia, with the help of the international community, will achieve peace and stability at an early date. China will join the international community in making its own contribution to this end.

Mr. Wisnumurti (Indonesia): Like previous speakers, my delegation would like to express its appreciation to the Secretary-General for his comprehensive report on the latest developments in Liberia. We are hopeful that the outcome of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Summit, held in Abuja on 17 August 1996, will lead to a durable peace in Liberia, with the new timetable serving as a formal framework for the peace process. It is worth noting and commending the strong regional leadership role of ECOWAS and its determination to ensure that the parties respect the agreement they themselves have entered into.

We are also encouraged by the growing influence of Liberian civilian groups in the peace process, reflecting the aspirations of the Liberian people to end this ongoing tragedy. In this regard, we welcome the appointment of Ms. Ruth Perry as the new Chairperson of the restructured Council of State, which, we hope, will fully represent the will of all Liberians. We expect all faction leaders to respect the authority and impartiality of this body and its new leadership.

In view of the tendency of faction leaders to renege on their past commitments, the international community and regional actors cannot but remain extremely vigilant. Several areas remain of great concern to us, particularly the lack of security that continues to reflect a dangerous and volatile situation, the persistent violations of basic human rights, and the continuing inflow of arms. In this regard, the disarming and demobilization of Liberia's militia members is also essential in establishing a durable cease-fire and permitting international peace-keepers to operate to their full potential. The Council, furthermore, must urge all States to comply strictly with the embargo on all deliveries of weapons and military equipment to Liberia, in accordance with resolution 788 (1992).

Touching on the humanitarian situation, my delegation remains concerned that relief workers are still being seriously impeded from delivering assistance to certain regions and that the safety of relief workers is still threatened. At this stage, no comprehensive humanitarian assistance can be constructed to meet the needs of Liberia, where socio-economic activities have ground to a halt. Furthermore, over half of Liberia's population continues to dwell in neighbouring countries as refugees. Conditions have to be created to promote the return of Liberians and the reconstruction of their country. Another aspect of the conflict that has to be kept in mind is how to reintegrate a generation of young Liberians who have known nothing but war for the past six years.

Against this backdrop, we believe that the ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) and the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL) can play a considerable role in contributing to the implementation of the Abuja Agreement and enhance its chances of moving forward. In this regard, we believe that the United Nations has a role to play, and we therefore support the recommendation of the Secretary-General to increase the number of military observers and civilian personnel to assist UNOMIL in carrying out its mandate. However, since the continued presence of UNOMIL is contingent on ECOMOG's ability to ensure the safety of its personnel, it is therefore imperative for ECOMOG and UNOMIL to enhance coordination and cooperation.

In the light of the observations I have just made and of the positive role UNOMIL can play in Liberia, the Indonesian delegation will vote in favour of this draft resolution extending the mandate of UNOMIL for another three months, until 30 November 1996. We expect the parties to see this period as an opportunity for them to demonstrate, through concrete steps, the political will to resolve their differences and to start out on the path towards national reconciliation and development.

Mr. Gomersall (United Kingdom): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution extending the mandate of the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL) for a further three months. The recent reports of the Secretary-General and his Special Envoy confirm that the Agreement reached by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Committee of Nine at Abuja on 17 August

is a significant development that may at last offer real hope for the suffering people of Liberia. But it remains the case, as the draft resolution before us makes quite clear, that the key lies in the response, or otherwise, of the faction leaders who have publicly committed themselves to this Agreement. They must now disengage, disarm and demonstrate their willingness to reach a peaceful, lasting and democratic solution to the conflict.

For far too long this Council has been given clear demonstrations of the disdain of the faction leaders for the help of the international community and for the interests of the people of their own country. Agreement after agreement has been torn up by the so-called warlords; cease-fires violated; innocent civilians killed; children forced into combat; and the country's infrastructure laid to waste — all to satisfy the egos and thirst for power of those leaders. Time and again this Council has heard renewed commitments to peace from such people, and it would be easy to take a cynical approach and call it a day. But it is greatly to the credit of the leaders of the ECOWAS countries that they have not given up. Indeed they have become more determined to bring peace to this part of their region, and we owe it to them to give them our support. We commend and endorse the Agreement reached in Abuja last month. It gives the faction leaders another chance, and we note that severe penalties will be imposed on any faction leader who fails to abide by his commitments.

The faction leaders must take heed of this draft resolution. They must be under no illusion. This is the last chance for Liberia to resolve its problems with United Nations assistance. It is vital that the factions cease their intimidation and attacks against United Nations, ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) and non-governmental organization personnel, end the looting and return all stolen property, including especially that of the United Nations. Without this small sign of good will, the international community cannot be expected to contribute to the rehabilitation of the country and to provide humanitarian relief.

The United Kingdom welcomes the readiness of ECOWAS to provide additional peace-keepers to the ECOMOG forces. ECOMOG in its reinforced composition is doing a difficult job well. Its presence is vital. We also warmly welcome the decision of the United States to provide additional logistical and financial support to ECOMOG. The United Kingdom is considering a further contribution to the Trust Fund for Liberia, which would be provided for assistance to ECOMOG. We also intend to help with police training once stability has been established, and we urge other States to provide additional logistical support.

The revised timetable for the implementation of the Abuja Agreement gives the faction leaders clear signposts towards a peaceful settlement of the conflict leading to elections next year. Early disarmament is a vital part of the plan. The faction leaders themselves have accepted the timetable. The three-month extension of UNOMIL's mandate will test the will of the faction leaders to take these necessary steps. We hope, and urge, that they finally bow to the will of their own people, of their neighbours and of the international community to see this terrible civil war come to an end.

Mr. Park (Republic of Korea): The situation in Liberia has taken a significant turn for the better over the past several weeks. The cease-fire in Monrovia has held since its re-establishment on 26 May 1996. The stalled peace process has been brought back on track, thanks largely to the patient and concerted efforts of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). We welcome the ECOWAS decision on 17 August 1996 to extend the Abuja Agreement of 19 August 1995 until 15 June 1997, as well as its adoption of a new timetable for the implementation of the Agreement.

The firm determination of ECOWAS member States not to tolerate any further obstruction of the peace process is backed by a comprehensive set of measures to ensure compliance by the Liberian factions with the peace plan. Of these measures, we note in particular the exclusion from future elections of those obstructing the peace process and the invocation of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) 1996 Summit resolution calling for the establishment of a war crimes tribunal to try all human rights offenses against Liberians. These are clear reminders to the Liberian faction leaders of the alternatives which await them in the event they fail to comply with the peace plan.

As the Secretary-General notes in paragraph 53 of his report, the ECOWAS decisions are intended to give the Liberian faction leaders one last chance to restore a democratically elected government. We have not forgotten the atrocities committed by the feuding armed factions in the streets of Monrovia last April. However, we believe that the Liberian faction leaders are fully aware of what they need to do to redeem themselves before the international community for all their past

misdeeds. While we welcome the commitment of the Liberian faction leaders to the ECOWAS decisions, we will be watching closely how faithfully they abide by their commitments.

The final outcome of the peace process will hinge on whether free and fair elections are held on 30 May 1997. While ECOWAS Foreign Ministers have identified the requisite conditions to ensure free and fair elections, we attach great importance to the full independence of the electoral Commission and to disarmament substantial enough so that the free participation of the Liberian people in the democratic process will not be constrained. In this connection, the growing influence of Liberia's civil society, manifested in the course of ECOWAS decisions and the designation of the new Chairperson of the Council of State, Ms. Ruth Perry, are encouraging signs for peace and democracy in Liberia. We look forward to a greater involvement of civil society in the process of free and fair elections. We also emphasize that if disarmament is to have true significance, it should be backed by strict enforcement of the arms embargo imposed on Liberia by resolution 788 (1992).

Given the vital importance of the elections for the future of Liberia, the imperative of ensuring the impartiality and independence of the electoral Commission cannot be overemphasized. By ensuring the independence and impartiality of the electoral Commission, the international community can avoid a situation in which the conscience of humanity may be disturbed by the unfortunate election of any of those who commits the heinous crime of violating the basic rules of international humanitarian law. We share the view that the United Nations should play a central role in the organization and conduct of the elections. In this regard, we believe that the Council should give serious consideration to the request by ECOWAS and the Liberian parties for assistance. We encourage the Secretariat to study the optimal ways and means by which the role of the United Nations can be enhanced to support the efforts of ECOWAS and to create conditions conducive to peace, stability and national reconciliation in Liberia.

In view of the commitment of ECOWAS to revive the peace process and remain engaged in Liberia through the installation of a new Government on 15 June 1997, my delegation fully supports the extension of the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL) mandate for a period of three months, as recommended by the Secretary-General. We also support the deployment of additional military observers within the Mission's currently authorized strength, as developments warrant.

With these remarks, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution before the Council. In concluding, I wish to express my Government's appreciation to those African States contributing troops to the ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG), despite serious financial constraints. We are also grateful to the United States Government for the generous financial support it has committed to ECOMOG. We remain confident that the active engagement of ECOWAS in Liberia can serve as a model of successful cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations in addressing the new kinds of challenges to international peace and security we now face in the post-cold-war world.

Mr. Martínez Blanco (Honduras)(*interpretation from Spanish*): On several occasions Honduras has expressed concern at the hostilities and deterioration in security conditions in Liberia, since they represent a threat to the peace process, tend to deepen the political crisis and negatively affect the observance of human rights and humanitarian assistance. At the same time, Honduras has regretted the Liberian parties' lack of political will to comply with the Abuja Agreement and to make a serious commitment to maintain the cease-fire.

For these reasons, my delegation welcomed the fact that the faction leaders and Liberian civilian groups have expressed agreement with the decisions adopted by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Foreign Ministers at the Summit meeting held on 17 August last, with respect to a revised five-stage implementation timetable for the Abuja Agreement, the recommendation to establish a code of conduct for the members of the Council of State and the transitional government and the conditions to be met for holding free and fair elections.

There is no need to emphasize the importance of the faction leaders' acceptance of the ECOWAS decisions for the effective implementation of the peace process in Liberia. We hope that this time the Liberian parties will effectively comply with their agreements and commitments to enable the holding of free and fair elections in May 1997, as anticipated.

As emphasized in the draft resolution the Council is about to adopt, the continued support of the international community for the Liberian peace process, including the

participation of the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL), depends on the Liberian factions' showing the will to resolve differences peacefully and achieve national reconciliation, pursuant to the commitments agreed to at Abuja.

My delegation also believes that a positive sign for the Liberian peace process is that the security situation is improving in various parts of the country and that the cease-fire in Monrovia is holding. We nevertheless regret the attacks and acts of intimidation directed against the personnel of ECOMOG, UNOMIL and the international organizations and bodies that provide humanitarian assistance, as well as the looting of their equipment. It is deplorable that the factions do not respect the personnel status of these missions and that all the property stolen has not yet been returned.

My delegation also recognizes the importance of increasing the number of the UNOMIL military observers so that the Mission will be better able to verify disarmament when it takes place and will furthermore be able to undertake wider-ranging patrols, as well as that of the measures recently adopted by ECOMOG to strengthen its presence in Liberia and to guarantee its viability as a real peace-keeping force, even though it still does not have sufficient human and financial resources to carry out its tasks. We also recognize the ECOWAS efforts to restore peace and to establish a democratically elected government in Liberia.

For these reasons, and in view of the importance of continuing the presence of UNOMIL in Liberia, my delegation agrees with the extension of its mandate for a three-month period and will vote in favour of the draft resolution before the Council.

Mr. Fedotov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Russian delegation notes with satisfaction the current positive developments in the situation in Liberia, which once again are reviving the once-dashed hopes of the world community that the many years of devastating conflict in that country might soon be brought to an end.

A key role in these developments has been played by the Summit of the member States of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) in Abuja, which has made possible the renewal of the peace process, the culmination of which must be the holding of free and fair elections by the end of May 1997.

We recognize the complexity of the implementation of these tasks, especially since in the past Liberian parties have repeatedly violated the agreements they themselves had signed. We hope that this time that will not happen, since the member States of ECOWAS, judging by the decisions they took in Abuja, are firmly determined to achieve strict implementation of the settlement plan.

We would also like especially to highlight those measures designed to enhance the vitality of the ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) as a genuine peace-keeping force: the establishment of a monitoring mechanism for the implementation of the agreement; the threat of harsh sanctions against the leaders of any faction that might presume to violate the rules of the game established in Abuja; the decision not to recognize any Government that might attempt to come to power by the use of force; and the desire to ensure full compliance with the arms embargo on Liberia.

It is exceedingly important that the member States of ECOWAS show the necessary determination and consistency in implementing this policy, clearly coordinating their activities. It is also necessary to have proper cooperation between ECOMOG and the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL) in carrying out their respective mandates; there lies the key to the success of the peace process.

Noting the substantial objective difficulties to the implementation of the Abuja Agreement, we believe it important that the efforts of the regional peace-keepers be supported by the necessary additional resources. At the same time, we are firmly convinced that responsibility for the establishment of peace in Liberia lies ultimately with Liberians themselves and with their leaders. We expect that they will make use of this last chance offered them for the speedy realization of the peace plan in all its aspects; otherwise, as is emphasized in the report (S/1996/684) of the Secretary-General, the international community will have no option but to leave Liberia.

The Russian delegation is prepared to support the draft resolution before the Council, giving a green light to the extension the mandate of the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia until 30 November 1996, and we note with satisfaction that this draft resolution clearly directs the Liberian parties to comply scrupulously with the commitments they have entered into and provides strong political impetus in support of the efforts to make progress in the peace process and in national reconciliation in Liberia.

Mr. Lopes Cabral (Guinea-Bissau) (*interpretation from French*): After a period of serious troubles resulting from the resumed fighting among the warring parties in Liberia, we can see — or at least we hope we can see — a period of relative, but important, peace and stability that has brought a partial return of normalcy to Monrovia. We welcome this turn of events. It represents the fruits of the tireless efforts of the Economic Community of West Africa (ECOWAS), which has deployed the ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) in the city of Monrovia and surrounding areas, where they have carried out a seal and search operation to recover the weapons abandoned by the factions during their retreat.

Guinea-Bissau welcomes the decision extending the Abuja Agreement until 15 June 1997 and establishing a specific plan for its implementation, providing the means to verify the faction leaders' compliance with the Agreement, and stipulating measures that could be taken against factions for non-compliance with the provisions of the Agreement.

These unprecedented coercive measures adopted by ECOWAS are proof of the determination and the cohesion of the West African Community. They have been decisive in the decision by the Liberian factions to end hostilities, disengage their forces and to surrender their weapons. We welcome the designation of Ms. Ruth Perry as Chairperson of the Council of State and wish her every success in carrying out her mission, which is no doubt a difficult one, but one that enjoys the support of the international community. It has every chance for success, provided that the commitments entered into by the factions and the schedule and modalities for the holding of free elections are respected.

In view of this progress and the improvement in the security situation in Liberia, we support the Secretary-General's proposal in paragraph 23 of his report (S/1996/684) to deploy immediately an additional 24 military observers to the country, with a view to consolidating the presence of the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL). That presence would facilitate more frequent patrolling and future disarmament operations.

Guinea-Bissau, as a country of the subregion and a member of ECOWAS, has always expressed its frustration over the limited means available to ECOMOG. We therefore once again call on the international community to provide it with the necessary assistance to fully carry out its responsibilities.

In this connection, I wish to highlight the contribution of the United States, whose delegation deserves the credit for proposing to the other members of the Security Council a draft resolution that has been able to take into account and bring together all views. This has ultimately enabled us to reach the consensus that we welcome today.

I also wish to welcome the contributions of other countries, which, in our view, are of crucial importance. We thank them warmly, and we encourage other States to make their own contributions to the United Nations Trust Fund for Liberia.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the international community will not be in a position to continue to support the peace process in Liberia if the Liberian factions do not show beyond doubt that they are determined to settle all their differences through peaceful means and to achieve national reconciliation, in accordance with the Abuja Agreement of 17 August 1996.

In this context, we demand once again that the Liberian factions strictly respect all their commitments under the Abuja Agreement and the personnel statutes of ECOMOG, UNOMIL and other international organizations and agencies. Looting, thievery and other acts of banditry must cease immediately and all stolen objects must be returned. We must also demand that the Liberian faction leaders respect and protect the children whom they use as cannon fodder, an odious and abhorrent practice that we shall always condemn.

In conclusion, we subscribe to the Secretary-General's recommendation to extend the mandate of UNOMIL for a period of three months. My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution before the Security Council today.

Mr. Matuszewski (Poland): On many previous occasions, my delegation has expressed its deep concern about the situation in Liberia, about eruptions of violence directed against innocent civilian populations and about the Liberian leaders being unable to peacefully resolve their conflict. Serious questions concerning future involvement of the international community in Liberia have frequently come to mind. These concerns have not disappeared yet.

Nevertheless, the Polish delegation is going to vote in favour of the draft resolution extending the mandate of

the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL) by three months, until the end of November 1996. By doing so we would like to confirm our confidence in and support for the leaders of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the decisions they took at Abuja two weeks ago.

We also take note of the declared readiness of the heads of the Liberian armed factions to abide by the agreements they all signed and to allow the country to resolve its problems by political means rather than by resorting to violence, often in its cruellest form. It is our hope that this time the warlords in Liberia will not follow the well-known pattern of breaking their word.

The task of rebuilding the structure of the State, of repairing its social fabric and of restoring the peoples' confidence and morale is truly enormous. Nobody but the Liberians themselves is responsible for their future and for achieving peace, security and stability in their country.

Liberia is in need of international assistance. We expect the people of that country, and especially their leaders, to create and maintain an assistance-friendly environment. We ask them in particular to respect the status of the personnel of the Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG), UNOMIL and international organizations and agencies to facilitate the freedom of movement of peace-keepers and ensure an uninterrupted delivery of humanitarian goods.

And last but not least, the Liberian leaders and their followers must live up to their obligations resulting from the Agreement at Abuja, including the timetable for implementation of this Agreement.

Let me conclude by expressing my appreciation of the initiative of the Permanent Representative of Italy to include in the draft resolution a clause condemning the practice of making children fight and kill. As a representative of one of the countries at whose initiative the General Assembly adopted the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, I feel it my duty to restate my full support for efforts aimed at the immediate cease of this inhuman practice.

Mr. Searle (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On many occasions when the Security Council has met to deal with the situation in Liberia, we have had to refer to breaches of the cease-fire, to resumptions of hostilities and, in general, to continually unfulfilled agreements.

My delegation hopes that we are coming to the end of that cycle of tragedies that has characterized the peace process in Liberia and that the new timetable for implementation of the Abuja Agreement, agreed to at the recent Summit of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) on 17 August, will mark the beginning of the final restoration of peace and stability to, and the reconstruction of, Liberia.

We appreciate the extremely valuable and effective role played by ECOWAS and the positive events that the Secretary-General relates in his latest report to the Security Council. These enable us to consider favourably at this time a three-month extension of the mandate of the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL), as well as to maintain the deployment of this force at appropriate levels.

Furthermore, the appeal contained in the draft resolution to provide logistical and financial support so that ECOMOG can carry out its mandate is fully in keeping with the above.

In the context of the new schedule for implementing the Abuja Agreement, we attach particular importance to the monitoring mechanism that enables ECOWAS to monitor compliance with the planned stages, as well as to the warning of measures that may be taken against those who might obstruct the Agreements.

The statement made by the Heads of State of ECOWAS that they would not recognize any government that came to power in Liberia through the use of force is very relevant, in the view of my delegation, since that is an essential element for laying the foundation of any lasting process of peace and reconciliation.

Furthermore, we welcome the designation of the new Chairperson of the Council of State, and particularly the fact that that decision reflects the increasing influence of Liberian civilian society in the peace process. My delegation urges that efforts continue at all levels to ensure that that influence grows, because we are convinced that it will be the most effective manner to achieve peace and stability for all Liberians.

In considering the peace process over the years, we think that it is timely to warn the leaders of the factions that they must bear clearly in mind that the international community's patience is not unlimited. The reprehensible events of last April, characterized by threats to the security of the people and the personnel of international

organizations, as well as the generalized looting of property, cannot be tolerated again. Even less can we tolerate the continuation of the inhuman and barbaric practice of recruiting, training and using children in combat. For this reason, my delegation decidedly supports Italy's initiative, which has been supported by the Council and is reflected in paragraph 9 of the draft resolution before us.

We hope that actions, more than promises, will enable this Council to continue to back the peace process in Liberia and that the timetable decided in Abuja will be complied with without delay so that by installing in June 1997 a new, democratically elected government, the people of Liberia will start on its long-desired path to progress, development and well-being.

In conclusion, we wish to express our gratitude to the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General, Ambassador James Jonah; his Special Representative, Mr. Anthony Nyakyi; and to all the military and civilian personnel of UNOMIL and humanitarian agencies who have been sorely tried in recent times, and who are now beginning this new stage with renewed hope.

The President: I now put to the vote the draft resolution in document S/1996/701.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Botswana, Chile, China, Egypt, France, Germany, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Indonesia, Italy, Poland, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The President: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 1071 (1996).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. Inderfurth (United States of America): May I first express my delegation's appreciation to those members of the Council who have so kindly acknowledged the role we have played with respect to the resolution just adopted by the Council, as well as the assistance the United States provided in the evacuation of other nationals from Liberia.

During the past seven years, the factions in Liberia have conducted bloody, destructive civil war that has cost the lives of many thousands of innocent Liberians and robbed the country of its wealth and resources. Only a few months ago, Monrovia was in flames. Political and ethnic factions were engaged in street-to- street fighting. Looting, including of humanitarian and peace-keeping resources, was widespread. Thousands were taking refuge at the United States Embassy, and the United States and others were working hard to evacuate boatloads and planeloads of non-Liberians to safety. These tragic events seemed to mark a new low point in Liberia's descent towards political and social chaos, and were a profound sorrow to the friends of Liberia around the world and the international community, which had tried so hard and for so long to help.

One especially abhorrent practice in this tragic conflict — singled out by the Italian delegation for special consideration and condemnation in the Council's resolution — has been the recruitment, training and actual deployment of children in combat. Who can forget the photographs of child soldiers brandishing and using assault weapons? Who can imagine the psychological scars that will be left with these children for years to come? The Council is determined that this abhorrent practice shall not continue.

The regional leaders, meeting in Abuja in mid-August, shared the frustration of the rest of the international community and took a bold step. They agreed to reinvigorate their 1995 Agreement, including a new timetable for implementation and the threat of sanctions for persons or groups that obstruct progress. The United States commends the efforts of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) under the new chairmanship of Nigeria to get the warring parties to end the violence, to disarm their combatants and to begin the process of national reconciliation, beginning with a cease-fire and culminating in the holding of free and fair elections.

The Liberian faction leaders appear to have accepted this new timetable. Their initial statements and actions offer hope that progress towards peace and stability is possible in the coming months. The Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) has successfully re-established and is maintaining Monrovia as a safe haven. ULIMO-J has delivered stolen heavy weapons. A new ECOMOG commander has taken steps that will make the peace-keeping force more effective. Ruth Perry has been named

new Chairperson of the Council of State, and we wish her well in her daunting task of national mediation and unification.

Yet the recent history of Liberia is littered with broken promises and lost opportunities for peace. It is important that the faction leaders realize that the world is more concerned with their deeds than with their words. The United States will be monitoring closely their actions under the 17 August Agreement.

It is only on the basis of honest implementation of the new timetable that the United States is able to support the Secretary-General's call for increased deployments of the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL). These deployments are justified, wise, and ultimately secure only if the peace process remains on track. We will follow events closely and calibrate our actions to coincide with progress towards implementation of the Abuja Agreement. In this regard, the United States will examine especially closely the Secretary-General's 15 October report called for by this resolution.

The Liberian factions bear a clear, unavoidable responsibility to respect the status of UNOMIL personnel and property, as well as those of ECOMOG and other international and humanitarian organizations and agencies. In this regard, we expect the faction leaders to take steps to return immediately all looted property.

More broadly, the ECOWAS States and the wider international community must insist on compliance and do everything necessary to ensure implementation by the parties. I would also like to stress the importance of close contacts and enhanced cooperation between UNOMIL and ECOMOG. Flexibility and active promotion of good relations by UNOMIL will be essential to ensuring that UNOMIL can fulfil its mandate. In this respect, the deployment of additional liaison officers is a step forward.

The United States believes that UNOMIL can play a positive role in the process if the Liberian factions demonstrate real commitment to the Abuja Agreement. The United States will be watching closely with every hope that we are indeed seeing the beginning of the end of this tragic episode in Liberia.

Finally, personnel serving with UNOMIL have endured hardship and served under perilous conditions. We commend them for their sacrifices and reiterate our belief that their safety remains a prime consideration. We also express our appreciation to Mr. James Jonah, in his role as Special Envoy of the Secretary-General, for his extremely useful contribution to the Security Council as it addressed this issue.

Mr. Ladsous (France) (*interpretation from French*): The French delegation has carefully studied the report the Secretary-General has issued on the situation in Liberia. This report gives a grim account of the consequences of the clashes in Monrovia last April in humanitarian and economic terms. It also shows the grave consequences for the United Nations Mission, most of whose staff had to be withdrawn and a great deal of whose equipment has been looted. The French delegation vigorously condemns these misdeeds, and will attach special importance to the return of this equipment.

The new plan for the implementation of the Abuja Agreement, revised by the States of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) during its last meeting, on 14 and 17 August, gives rise to new hopes. We would like to pay tribute to the renewed efforts of the regional leaders in this matter.

We know how guarded hope should be in this respect, since experience has shown that the factions have several times disregarded their commitments. We venture to believe, as is indicated in the Secretary-General's report, that the sanctions accompanying the plan will be an important guarantee of its implementation. Yet another failure would be tragic, for it could lead to a withdrawal of the international community, to a widespread renewal of fighting and to a major threat to stability in the region.

France has constantly given its support to the peace process in Liberia. It will do so once again by agreeing, as is recommended by the Secretary-General, to extend the mandate of the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL) for a three-month period. It also supports the intentions of the Secretary-General with regard to the deployment of the Mission.

The President: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of Germany.

The civil war in Liberia has been a matter of deep concern for all of us since 1990. Since then, 13 peace agreements between the warring factions have been concluded and later broken. Our assessment of the situation in Liberia has always been clear: the responsibility for disrupting the peace process lies solely with the leaders of the various factions, who have shown no regard for the rights and lives of their people.

Since the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Summit of 17 August 1996 in Abuja, there is new hope that the peace process can be resumed successfully in Liberia. The ECOWAS States have decided to give the factions one last chance. The Committee of the Nine Heads of State and Government agreed on a strict timetable for the implementation of the Abuja Agreement, commencing with the restoration of the cease-fire by 31 August 1996 and concluding with the holding of free and fair elections on 30 May 1997. Why do we think that there is new hope?

The Committee of Nine has built into its timetable a monitoring mechanism to ensure compliance with the Abuja Agreement. The five major stages of the timetable — cease-fire, disengagement of factions, disarmament, preparations for elections and, finally, elections — will be verified by international observers. They will monitor whether the peace process is developing in a correct and stable direction.

Moreover, the Committee of Nine agreed in Abuja that any person or group obstructing the implementation of the Agreement will be subject to the imposition of sanctions. These sanctions will have a direct effect on this very person or group.

Finally, ECOWAS has underlined its commitment to remain engaged in Liberia until the new government is installed.

We have learned from the Secretary-General's latest report on Liberia, as well as from Ambassador James Jonah in his briefing in the Security Council, that the Abuja Agreement was also reached because of the insistence of various Liberian civilian groups present at the Abuja meeting. We hope that this can be regarded as the first nucleus of a democratic process that will allow the people of Liberia to decide their fate for themselves in a democratic manner.

The extension of the mandate of the United Nations Observer Mission in Liberia (UNOMIL) and the deployment of an additional 24 military observers, in accordance with the resolution which we have just adopted, is a first appropriate response of the United Nations to the new developments in Liberia. We agree that the ECOWAS Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) has to be provided with adequate financial and logistic resources to carry out its task. We also believe that future assistance will have to be more closely coordinated than in the past.

It should, however, be clear that the missions of ECOMOG and UNOMIL can only be continued in a meaningful way if conditions in Liberia allow them to fulfil their mandates. We therefore strongly urge the warring parties to seize this opportunity, which may be their very last.

International humanitarian assistance is also necessary to sustain the peace process and is an additional stabilizing factor. After the recent fighting in April and May of this year alone Germany has provided humanitarian aid and medicine worth about DM600,000.

The international community and, in particular, the Economic Community of West African States have not given up on Liberia. Our support and best wishes go the new Chairperson of the Liberian State Council, Ms. Ruth Perry, and there was consensus in our consultations that the United Nations should make another effort in support of the Liberian peace process.

On the basis of these considerations, Germany voted in favour of the resolution, which was initiated and introduced by the delegation of the United States, to which we wish to express our thanks.

I now resume my function as President of the Council.

There are no further speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.3695

Security Council
Fifty-first Year

Provisional

3695th Meeting
Friday, 30 August 1996, 3 p.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Eitel	(Germany)
Members:	Botswana	Mr. Nkgowe
	Chile	Mr. Larraín
	China	Mr. He Yafei
	Egypt	Mr. Abdel Aziz
	France	Mr. Ladsous
	Guinea-Bissau	Mr. Da Gama
	Honduras	Mr. Martínez Blanco
	Indonesia	Mr. Thayeb
	Italy	Mr. Fulci
	Poland	Mr. Wrobel
	Republic of Korea	Mr. Choi
	Russian Federation	Mr. Fedotov
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Lloyd
	United States of America	Mr. Inderfurth

Agenda

The situation in Burundi

Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Burundi (S/1996/660)

96-86150 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Burundi

Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Burundi (S/1996/660)

The President: In accordance with the decisions taken by the Council at its 3692nd meeting on this item, I invite the representative of Burundi to take a seat at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Australia, Belgium, Canada, Ethiopia, Ireland, Japan, South Africa, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania to take the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nsanze (Burundi) took a seat at the Council table; Mr. Rowe (Australia), Mr. Wouters (Belgium), Mr. Karsgaard (Canada), Mr. Mohammed (Ethiopia), Mr. Murphy (Ireland), Mr. Konishi (Japan), Mr. Jele (South Africa), Mr. Mukasa-Ssali (Uganda) and Mr. Nkurlu (United Republic of Tanzania) took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda, which was begun at the 3692nd meeting, held on 28 August 1996. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/1996/708, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Botswana, Chile, Egypt, Germany, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Indonesia, Republic of Korea, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. The Russian Federation has joined as a sponsor of the draft resolution.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall first call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

Mr. Larraín (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution that we will be adopting today: Botswana, Egypt, Germany, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Indonesia, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Chile.

The draft resolution that we will be adopting by consensus today reflects the position of the Security Council: united in support of the goal of helping Burundi reach a comprehensive political settlement with the participation of the entire international community.

It also reflects an unequivocal stand to lend the strongest support to regional leaders, to the Arusha agreements of 31 July and to the Organization of African Unity. In particular, we are lending our strongest support to former President Julius Nyerere in his laudable efforts to assist Burundi to overcome peacefully the crisis it is undergoing.

The Security Council declares its readiness to support Burundi if its leaders set out on the path to peace, political negotiation and reconciliation through international cooperation and other initiatives.

It also indicates with unwavering resolve that if within 60 days, those leaders have not initiated the necessary negotiations to bring about a comprehensive political settlement, the Council will then consider the imposition of measures under the Charter, including an arms embargo and other measures targeted against the leaders of the regime and of the factions that continue to promote violence and to stand in the way of a peaceful solution. In that case, the measures will meet objective criteria based on the information submitted to us by the Secretary-General.

This draft resolution also expresses the consensus in the Council that the present crisis should not exacerbate the humanitarian suffering of the population of that country, and it mentions the need to ensure that humanitarian corridors are established so that all in Burundi may have access to assistance. As can be noted, together with the hope that that country will once again take the path of political negotiation, we are moved by a strong concern over the humanitarian situation of the population and of those who are working with them to alleviate their suffering.

The draft resolution unambiguously condemns the use of force and violence in Burundi, both in the overthrow of the legitimate Government and in the resort to violence by the parties to attain their political objectives. We are also calling on the regime to bring about a return to constitutional order and legality, to restore the National Assembly and to lift the ban on all political parties.

The Security Council will meet again on 31 October to assess the situation. It is the sincere hope of the sponsors — and of the international community — that that meeting will serve to support the negotiations that should by then have begun in Burundi. But if that is not the case, let there be no doubt that we shall proceed to consider whatever measures may be deemed appropriate to achieve the initiation of those negotiations.

The President: I now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/1996/708.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Botswana, Chile, China, Egypt, France, Germany, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Indonesia, Italy, Poland, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The President: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 1072 (1996).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. Ladsous (France) (*interpretation from French*): The French delegation voted in favour of the resolution just adopted by the Council. I wish to point out that France welcomed the steps taken by the authors of the draft from the time it was first submitted to the Council. Indeed, this draft reiterated a number of concerns that had been previously expressed, in particular by the European Union in its statement of 19 August last.

France has been expressing these concerns directly to Major Buyoya since 25 July, emphasizing certain points: first of all, that a dialogue should be organized very quickly that would bring together all the political forces, bar none, in order to negotiate an institutional and democratic consensus; and, secondly, that political votes of confidence should be given very rapidly to all the political elements in the country, that commitments to respect human rights must be made, and that the major State bodies and institutions must be gradually but very concretely opened up to all ethnic groups. Only a political solution can settle the crisis in Burundi, because any explosion of violence would almost inevitably lead to external intervention.

In the immediate future, the Army's behaviour must be beyond reproach, and security guarantees must be given to the former leaders, deputies and members of FRODEBU. As all the problems affecting the region require a comprehensive settlement, it is important and urgent that a conference be held under the auspices of the United Nations, and in cooperation with the Organization of African Unity (OAU), that would deal in a lasting manner with the crises in the Great Lakes region.

The recent resumption of dialogue between Major Buyoya and former President Nyerere is an initial encouraging response to the requests made by the international community. This first step must be followed by other concrete measures, which are set out in the resolution the Council has just adopted, in particular, the prompt opening of negotiations between all the parties, without exception. That is why the French delegation approved of the idea that the Council should reconsider this item within 60 days, and if this last requirement is not met, that it could consider the implementation of binding measures. It seems important to us that such measures, if we must resort to them, be defined in such a way as not to increase the suffering of the population, but, rather, to help stem violence and punish those responsible for such violence.

Regarding measures taken by the countries in the region at the Arusha meeting on 31 July, my delegation wishes to reiterate the grave concern it has already expressed — concern shared by our partners in the European Union and by many international humanitarian organizations — over their humanitarian impact, especially on the most disadvantaged sectors of the population. This question should be carefully considered on an urgent basis. It is essential, in particular, to allow international and non-governmental organizations to continue their work in favour of these sectors.

Mr. Fulci (Italy): Italy voted in favour of the resolution because in matters such as the Burundi crisis, it is essential that the country show unanimity. But I would be remiss if, on this occasion, I did not call the Council's attention to document S/1996/673 of 19 August

1996, which contains a letter from the Irish Presidency of the European Union and the Presidency declaration, on behalf of the Union, on Burundi. Allow me simply to quote the two main paragraphs of that declaration:

> "The European Union wishes to express its support for the regional leaders, the Organization of African Unity and the former President of the United Republic of Tanzania, Mr. Julius Nyerere, in the efforts that they have been making to assist Burundi to peacefully overcome the grave crisis it is experiencing and encourages them to continue in their efforts to facilitate the search for a political solution.
>
> "The European Union considers it essential that a dialogue be organized without delay, bringing together all of Burundi's political forces, without exception, including representatives of civil society, in order to negotiate a democratic institutional consensus and ensuring security for all."

This is the second time in one month that the Security Council has expressed its clear position on the *coup d'état* in Burundi. We have fully subscribed to this position. We believe that now the time has come to replace confrontation with dialogue, dialogue of all with all, and to see what fruits this will produce. Therefore, Italy appeals to all the parties in Burundi to exercise restraint and to show a really constructive attitude, in order to put the country back on the track of democracy, national reconciliation, economic reconstruction and development, without which there can be no lasting peace.

The President: The representative of Burundi has asked to speak and I now call on him.

Mr. Nsanze (Burundi)(*interpretation from French*): I can assure the Security Council in advance that I will not tax its patience or abuse its generosity, but when a delegation requests to speak, it is because it knows better than anyone what the problem is.

The Security Council's fervent attachment to saving Burundi calls for its people and its Government to pay a stirring tribute to the Council. Nevertheless, the stakes for Burundi are immeasurably immense. For these fundamental reasons, it is incumbent on my delegation to work closely and at all levels with the honourable members of this learned body. The efforts made by the Security Council in favour of Burundi are edifying.

On behalf of my Government, it is my duty to convey to the honourable President of the Security Council and to all the eminent members of this body the gratitude they deserve for the continuous concern they have displayed for three years now for the cause of my beloved country. Special recognition is deserved by Ambassador Juan Somavía and his delegation, as the architects of the main foundation of the resolution just adopted. All his colleagues representing the Non-Aligned Movement in the Security Council have distinguished themselves by their sense of responsibility and by their openness to concessions, and thanks to their openness to compromise, a reasonable outcome has been achieved.

The clearly realistic position of the European Union and 14 other European countries, as reflected in the statement made by the representative of Ireland is deeply appreciated by my country and my Government.

The new regime not only is receptive to the very well-founded appeals of the Security Council, but it is prepared to initiate a set of measures aimed at implementing the provisions of this resolution which are compatible — and I emphasize compatible — with the sacred and supreme interests of Burundi as a nation and in keeping with the Organization of African Unity (OAU) Charter and the United Nations Charter. Those measures include, in particular, the initiation of a democratic process adapted to national needs and talks with all groups that agree to participate in the patriotic task required to save the people of Burundi from another genocide and to ensure the safety not of just one ethnic group but of the nation of Burundi as a whole. Our colleague, Ambassador Ladsous just referred to multi-ethnicity. In fact, that concept has been artificially created by mediocre politicians because the very high degree of human integration achieved by the nation of Burundi has been shattered by the work of politicians who, instead of using their personal and professional skills for political objectives, use ethnicity as a way to attain selfish goals.

Finally, the Burundi Government will apply itself and commit itself to a relentless fight against the armed bands and militias of all stripes, to put an end to the cycle of violence and scorched- earth politics, whoever the perpetrators might be. This is a necessary condition for the new regime to eradicate all the causes of the national tragedy. This Herculean task cannot be accomplished quickly.

In this context, the current authorities in Burundi are counting on the patience and indulgence of the Security Council, as this gigantic enterprise will no doubt be marked by a series of obstacles. The arbitrary economic sanctions imposed on Burundi are an enormous stumbling-block in the way of the general national stabilization programme of the Government. Indeed, geographically land-locked, diplomatically encircled and economically strangled, Burundi finds it impossible to meet fully and quickly all the conditions imposed by the resolution.

This colossal stumbling-block placed in front of the new regime leads me to point out the major defects of the resolution. The first is the absence of express condemnation of the economic blockade decreed against Burundi. The second is the at least temporary refusal to establish an ad hoc commission to be dispatched to the Great Lakes region to gather objective and legitimate facts related to all the problems of the region. The last is the sword of Damocles in the form of threats against erroneous targets, especially the threat of an arms embargo: one cannot penalize the new regime, much less the people of Burundi, for crimes perpetrated by outlaws.

What emerges from this state of affairs is that the Security Council resolution may, from the moment of its adoption, be destined to be hamstrung because of these serious factors. We are counting on the assistance of the Security Council to bypass or remove the stumbling-blocks I have enumerated.

The President: There are no further speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 3.35 p.m.